DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 316 279 JC 900 139

AUTHOR Kelly, Diana K.
TITLE A Human Resources Development Approach to Part-Time Faculty in the Community College.
PUB DATE 6 Mar 90
NOTE 151p.; Masters Thesis, Claremont Graduate School.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Dissertations/Theses - Master Theses (042)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; *Faculty College Relationship; *Faculty Development; Full Time Faculty; Literature Reviews; *Part Time Faculty; Questionnaires; Statistical Analysis; Tables (Data); *Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Role; Teaching Load; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS Fullerton College CA

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to determine the characteristics, qualifications, frustrations, and institutional involvement of part-time faculty at community colleges. The study involved a review of the literature on trends in and statistics on part-time faculty employment; the motivations, characteristics, advantages and disadvantages, quality, frustrations, management, integration, involvement, and professional development of part-time faculty; and policy issues. In addition, the study included a survey of 314 part-time faculty at Fullerton College in California to determine the variety and scope of teaching methods used, the level of interest in faculty development activities, the organizational involvement of and communication with part-timers, and the length and depth of their teaching experiences. Survey results included the following: (1) nearly 70% of the part-timers at Fulerton College were between the ages of 30 and 49, nearly 60% were male, and over 66% had a master's degree or doctorate; (2) the Business Division employed the greatest number of part-time faculty, followed by the Humanities Division; (3) 40% of the part-timers taught vocational subjects; (4) although part-time faculty used a variety of teaching methods, 93% used the traditional lecture method, 75% used class discussions, and over 50% used question-answer reviews and hands-on activities; (5) almost 97% gave students a course outline or syllabus at the beginning of the semester, nearly 94% provided grading criteria, and over 63% provided a week-by-week schedule; (6) 28% talked to their department chairs and over half to other faculty once per week, but 82% did not attend division meetings; (7) about 19% had been teaching at Fullerton a year or less; and (8) 56% would like a full-time teaching position at any college. Conclusions regarding the application of a human resources development approach to part-time faculty are provided. The survey instrument is appended. (JMC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED316279

A HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT APPROACH TO PART-TIME FACULTY IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

by

DIANA K. KELLY

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of The Claremont Graduate School in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Education.

Claremont, California

March 6, 1990

JC 900 139

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. K. Kelly

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
Review of the Literature	5
Background on Part-time Faculty: History and Statistics	5
Motivations and Characteristics of Part-time Faculty	6
Advantages and Disadvantages of Part-time Faculty	9
Quality of Part-time Faculty	12
Frustrations of Part-time Faculty	16
Management of Part-time Faculty	20
Integration and Involvement	23
Development of Part-time Faculty	25
Policy Issues and Recommendations	31
Conclusion	34
Methodology	36
The Survey Instrument	37
Analysis of the Data	38
Results	44
Frequencies	44
Involvement Profiles	49
Professional Profiles	53
Involvement Analysis	59

	Page
Discussion	62
Characteristics of Part-time Faculty	62
Qualifications of Part-time Faculty	66
Frustrations of Part-time Faculty	68
Involvement of Part-time Faculty	71
Conclusion: How Colleges can Apply a Human Resources Development Approach to Part-time Faculty	78
References	83
Appendices	90
Appendix A: Survey Instrument and Follow-Up Reminders	
Appendix B: Survey Response Frequencies	
Appendix C: Statistical Analysis	

A Human Resources Development Approach to Part-Time Faculty in the Community College

The increasing use of part-time faculty has become a matter of concern to many in the community college. Part-time faculty are teaching an increasing proportion of classes, and in many community colleges part-time faculty far outnumber full-time faculty. Why have community colleges increased their use of part-time faculty? First, they are often considered "faculty of convenience," hired when needed, with no guarantee of employment from one semester to the next. Moreover, community colleges often use part-time faculty as a cost-saving measure. Although their qualifications may be identical, they are usually paid less than full-time faculty, and they generally receive no benefits. Presumably the lower rate of pay is justified because they are usually not expected to hold office hours, nor are they expected be be involved in institutional service. As a result, most part-time faculty do what they are expected to do: they come in, they teach their classes, and they leave. Interestingly, because they are rarely on campus, department chairs and full-time faculty often assume that the part-timers are not interested in being involved. Finally, there are often nagging doubts that perhaps the part-time faculty are really not as well qualified as the full-time faculty. From the administration's point of view, part-timers are convenient and they cost the college less than full-time faculty, but they do not seem to be interested in being involved in the college, and they may not be well qualified to teach.

The frustrations of part-time faculty members have been the subject of many studies. Some want a full-time position, but have instead settled for several part-time positions in different community colleges to make up a full teaching load, thus becoming "freeway fliers" or "academic gypsies." Some teach classes at as many as five or six different

colleges. Other part-time faculty work full-time in business and come to the community college to teach one evening class each week. Usually these part-timers teach because they enjoy sharing their knowledge and skills with students who are eager to enter the same business or profession. Generally these part-time faculty who work full-time in business have no interest in ultimately teaching full-time. Some part-timers may desire greater involvement in the department. They often feel isolated because they rarely come into contact with other faculty members in their department. For this reason, some part-time faculty members may simply want an opportunity to meet other faculty members in the department to exchange ideas about the classes they teach. Some may even want to become more involved in the department by helping to develop curriculum in their subject area, and they may feel frustrated when they are locked out of the departmental decision-making process. And part-time faculty are often frustrated at the lack of facilities which are available to them, particularly in the evening: office space, clerical assistance, copying machines, and other facilities which are needed as aids to teaching. Finally, some part-time faculty members, particularly those from business or industry, may have no previous teaching experience. If they are not assisted by experienced faculty members when they are new, they may become frustrated simply because they feel inadequate as teachers. To sum up, there are a number of factors which can cause frustration for part-time faculty members in addition to a lower rate of pay, no benefits, and no guarantee of employment from one semester to the next.

So two major issues emerge: first, from the administration's point of view there is the concern that part-time faculty may not be well-qualified, are not involved, and may not be interested in being involved in the college; and second, from the part-timers' viewpoint there are multiple frustrations associated with part-time teaching positions.

These are difficult issues to resolve, and for this reason many community colleges may have chosen to simply ignore them. However, by taking an attitude of human resources development, community colleges may be able to come up with solutions to these concerns which will satisfy both the college and the part-time faculty members. The human resources development approach recognizes the value of the individual as a potential contributing member to the organization. If part-time faculty were viewed as a valuable resource to the college, they would probably be treated very differently. The college might feel a more pressing desire to resolve the frustrations in order to cultivate a pool of well-qualified part-time faculty who would be an asset to the institution. In other words, the college could benefit by taking advantage of the talents of part-time faculty, and the part-time faculty could benefit by having a more positive and supportive working environment.

This study will attempt to answer three questions. First, are the part-time faculty well-qualified? Do they deserve to be viewed as a "valuable human resource" by the institution? If the faculty are well-qualified, institutions will need to weigh the costs and benefits of providing higher salaries and additional services, such as clerical support, office space, and faculty development activities, in order to attract and keep the well-qualified faculty. Second, what are the frustrations of the part-time faculty, and how can institutions resolve the frustrations in order to cultivate a high quality pool of part-time faculty? It may be possible for institutions to greatly reduce some of the frustrations of part-time faculty with very little effort and no cost. And finally, are part-time faculty interested in greater involvement? If so, how can colleges increase the participation and involvement of part-time faculty to take advantage of their expertise? For instance, in vocational fields, part-timers who are currently working in the profession may be

encouranged to help plan curriculum because they are more keenly aware of the skills and knowledge necessary to gain employment in the field.

It is expected that this study will result in a greater understanding of the characteristics of part-time faculty by looking at their qualifications, frustrations, and involvement. Through a better understanding, college administrators may be able to manage part-time faculty in a more positive way, by using a more positive human resources development approach to benefit both the college and the part-time faculty.

Review of the Literature

Background on Part-time Faculty: History and Statistics.

When did community colleges start using part-time faculty, and for what reasons? In the 1930's community colleges, generally called "junior colleges," employed secondary school teachers and university professors to teach individual courses in specialized subjects for two reasons: first, it was felt that it would be better to hire part-time faculty who were specialists in specific topics rather than hire full-time generalists, particularly in the sciences; and second, the curriculum could be better coordinated by hiring part-time faculty from the institutions that sent students to the junior colleges, and the institutions that received the graduates of junior colleges (Cohen & Brawer, 1989). Community colleges continued to use part-time faculty to teach highly specialized coursework in areas that could not support a full-time faculty position, such as special foreign languages and religions. In addition, part-time faculty were often hired in career fields in order to provide students with a very current perspective. By the mid-1970's, however, only two-thirds of part-time faculty were employed in full-time jobs elsewhere. Many part-time faculty were young graduate students who were working part-time in order to gain access to potential full-time openings.

It is common knowledge that the number of part-time faculty in higher education has increased dramatically since the 1960's. The number of part-time faculty employed nationwide in all colleges increased from 82,000 in 1960 to 220,000 in 1982 (Bowen & Schuster, 1986, p. 61). In 1982 part-time faculty accounted for 32 percent of the faculty in four-year colleges (Hartleb & Vilter, 1986, p.16), and thirteen percent of all full-time equivalent faculty were part-timers (Bowen & Schuster, 1986, p. 61).

In 1953, part time faculty represented 48 percent of all community college faculty, but by 1968 this had decreased to only 34 percent. In 1987 the percentage of part-time faculty increased again to 58 percent of all two-year faculty (Cohen & Brawer, 1989, p. 77). Bowen and Schuster attribute the heavier use of part-time faculty to declining prosperity in higher education, the need for flexibility in staffing due to shifting enrollments in programs, and the availability of an abundance of Ph.D's who had been unable to gain full-time academic employment (1986, p.61).

In California part-time faculty represent 60 percent of all community college faculty, and part-timers teach about one third of all class hours (California Community Colleges Board of Governors, 1987). It is estimated that nationwide in community colleges part-time faculty teach about 25 percent of all class hours (Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, 1988, p. 12). In 1987, 40 percent of all part-time faculty were in two-year colleges, yet only 17 percent of all full-time faculty were in two-year colleges. (Chronicle, 1989, p.46).

Motivations and Characteristics of Part-time Faculty.

Why do part-time faculty choose to teach part-time? A University of Virginia study of part-time faculty from 14 colleges and universities indicated that the most important motivation for teaching part-time was intrinsic (Leslie, Kellams, & Gunne, 1982, p.41-45). They teach for reasons of personal satisfaction: for enjoyment and fulfillment, for a stimulating environment, or for the prestige associated with college teaching. The second motivation was professional: the opportunity to bring current practices into the classroom while maintaining a primary profession in business. The third motivation for teaching part-time was termed "careerist:" those hoping to teach full-time, but temporarily settling for part-time work. Finally, the fourth motivation was economic,

although the researchers found that, because of the low pay, this was generally the least important reason for teaching part-time. In a Nebraska study of part-time faculty in non-credit programs, similar motivations were found. The reasons for teaching which received the highest rankings were intrinsic and professional: "because I learn by teaching"; "because it is a personal pleasure"; "to share my ideas, knowledge, or skills"; "because I am interested in the subject matter and want to advocate it"; and "because it gives me a sense of accomplishment" (Morton & Newman, 1984).

Several studies have attempted to categorize part-time faculty into different mutually exclusive groups. Probably the most widely known is Tuckman's typology (1978) which was developed from data collected in a 1976 AAUP-sponsored national study of 10,000 part-time faculty. Tuckman categorized part-timers into the following seven mutually exclusive groups: semi-retired persons (2.8 percent); graduate students teaching in institutions other than the one in which they are studying (21.2 percent); "Hopeful full-timers," those who hold part-time positions but want a full-time position (16.6 percent); "Full-mooners," those who have a full-time position at another institution or in business and teach part-time (27.6 percent); "Homeworkers" who do not want full-time employment because they are taking care of children or relatives at home (6.4 percent); and "Part-mooners," those who teach part-time at several institutions (13.6 percent). In addition, there are the "Part-unknowners" who do not fall into any of the above six categories and account for 11.8 percent of part-time faculty. It is somewhat difficult to determine conclusively that these groups are, in fact, mutually exclusive. For instance, it is likely that many faculty who are "Part-mooners" might also consider themselves "Hopeful full-timers." Graduate students might also be "Hopeful full-timers," and semi-retired persons could be "Part-mooners" who teach at several

institutions. In addition, the "Part-unknowners" category is somewhat unclear: do they fall into several groups, or none of the groups?

George B. Vaughan, president of Piedmont Virginia Community College in Charlottesville has a somewhat more simple approach to the typology of part-time faculty. Vaughan believes that part-time faculty members fall into roughly two categories: the "independents" who have another full-time job and are not striving for a full-time teaching position, and the "dependents" who are committed to teaching are are hoping for a full-time position (1986, pp. 24-25).

Many studies of the characteristics of part-time faculty have been conducted at single institutions. Hillsborough Community College in Tampa, Florida conducted a survey of part-time faculty in 1977. From the results of this survey, Quayle developed another typology of part-time faculty with three categories: Education Professionals (35 percent), those who are employed full-time or part-time as teachers at other educational institutions; Noneducation Professionals (26 percent), those who are employed full-time outside the teaching profession; and Permanent part-timers (44 percent), those who desire a full-time position in the community college (Leslie, Kellams, & Gunne, 1982, pp. 38-40). As with Tuckman's typology, it is possible that there is some overlap between the Education Professionals and the Permanent part-timers groups.

Mary Louise Turgeon completed an extensive study of the part-time faculty at Corning Community College in upstate New York (1983). Turgeon found that part-time faculty were younger than full-time faculty, and slightly over half were female. In addition, about 40 percent of the part-timers worked full-time in another job, 25 percent taught part-time so they could care for a child or relative at home, less than ten percent were teaching part-time because they could not find full-time work, and only 6 percent worked part-

time in another institution. Turgeon's results were somewhat different from those in Tuckman's typology which was based on a national study of part-time faculty in all colleges, not just community colleges.

These studies indicate clearly the difficulties in making generalizations about part-time faculty. It is very likely that their characteristics will be somewhat different in each institution, depending on local conditions, institutional size, and other unique institutional characteristics. For this reason, it is important for each institution to become familiar with the characteristics of their own part-time faculty through an institutional study rather than attempting to use data from national surveys to make generalizations about the characteristics of part-timers.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Part-time Faculty.

One of the advantages of utilizing part-time faculty is that many are content experts who may be used for teaching specialized classes (Quigley, 1986). Tucker (1984, p.364) cites eight additional advantages to employing part-time faculty: they cost less than full-time faculty; the commitments of the college are fewer; they generally have a positive attitude; they are usually up to date in their fields; they are an excellent source of recruitment for full-time positions when openings occur; they may understand the part-time students and their problems better than their full-time counterparts; they are rarely unionized; and they provide a vital link with the local community from which they are drawn. In addition, part-time faculty may add vitality to programs by providing new ideas, and they can be hired to meet changing student demands, providing the institution with increased flexibility. For instance, part-time faculty usually teach evening and weekend classes and off-campus extension classes which may at times and locations considered to be less desirable by full-time faculty.

Several additional advantages of part-time faculty have been noted by other writers. In her visits to community colleges in 35 states, Carol Eliason (1980) noted an additional benefit of part-time faculty: institutions can sometimes meet affirmative action guidelines by increasing the participation of females and minorities through part-time employment. Ernst and McFarlane (1978) list three major advantages of using part-time faculty in an administration of justice program which would be true in any vocational or professional program: sharing professional expertise gained from the field; providing role models for students who wish to enter the field; and offering professional liaisons which enhance the program and provide career opportunities for students. Finally, Barbara Ann Scott notes that in addition to the economic advantages offered by part-time faculty, they also offer an opportunity to try out new specialized courses or programs before making a full committment by hiring tenure-track faculty (1983).

However, Tucker (1984) also notes some of the problems associated with part-time faculty: they feel exploited with respect to salary; there is a lack of program continuity when a large share of the faculty is part-time; they are not available for student advising which imposes heavier than normal counseling responsibilities on full-time faculty; they are suspected of devoting insufficient time and effort to their course preperations; they do not contribute to institutional service such as committee work and curriculum development; when they outnumber full-time faculty it is feared that departmental program governance could be taken over by part-timers; and the frictions between full and part-time faculty members may be disruptive to a program (pp.364-365). Some believe that they weaken the institution because of a lack of full committment to teaching (Hairston, 1985). Moreover, research has shown that part-time faculty who do not have an adequate on-going support system may actually damage the reputation of the college

(Bramlett & Rodriguez, 1982-83). Ernst and McFarlane (1978) note the difficulties of building a cohesive college faculty if many are part-time. This can adversely affect the coordination of course content, uniform standards of student performance, and continuity of instruction. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching offers the following assessment of part-time faculty working conditions:

> "Part-time faculty operate under unfavorable conditions: no office, lack of time on campus, usually hired on short-term contracts. Because of a fragmented schedule, it is difficult for them to develop deep institutional commitments, and their connections with other faculty and with students are tenuous at best. The spirit of community is weakened" (Boyer, 1987, p. 137).

Bowen and Schuster (1984) believe that if colleges stopped depending heavily on part-timers, openings for thousands of well-qualified full-time faculty would result. Among the disadvantages of using part-time faculty mentioned by Bowen and Schuster are the fact that they are not available for student advising, and they do not participate in educational policy-making. For this reason, the burden of institutional service is heavier on the full-time faculty. Bowen and Schuster take the position that dependence on part-time faculty is a serious problem, and that institutions should retreat from the practice of employing part-timers (p.64).

The American Association of University Professors in its 1986 report on non-tenure track appointments, notes that the practice of hiring professors without prospects for tenure may have long-term negative implications for attracting aspiring scholars to academic jobs in the future: "... the continuing proliferation of these temporary positions -- filled by underpaid instructors with low status and no job security -- seems shortsighted and counterproductive" (Heller, 1986, p.23).

In summary, instutitions benefit from using part-time faculty because they are cost-efficient and they often provide current perspectives in business and professional fields. In addition, many part-time faculty enjoy the opportunity to share their expertise. But institutions are concerned about the lack of program continuity and the lack of community which result from using part-timers. And part-time faculty are concerned about the low rate of pay and less than desirable working conditions. Finally, an ethical question must be considered when weighing the advantages and disadvantages of using part-time faculty: should institutions bring their budgets into balance through inequitable pay to group of qualified individuals?

Quality of Part-time Faculty.

College enrollments have recently been shifting to include a greater number of adult students who attend college in the evening, and who typically encounter part-time faculty who teach evening classes (Tucker, 1984). For this reason, colleges should ensure that the quality of the part-time faculty is good for this increasingly important segment of the student population. Tucker notes, "If part-time instructors are either unhappy with their conditions of employment or inadequately skilled to do a satisfactory job of teaching, the resulting student dissatisfaction could affect enrollments" (p.366).

Bowen & Schuster (1986) state that although many part-time faculty are "highly capable and add to the quality and diversity of available talent" (p.63), many are of "mediocre talent and training." They mention the suspicion that "the average ability level among them is lower than that for full-timers, though there is no hard evidence on this matter" (p.63).

Despite the suspicions of lower quality which are common in higher education, some studies have suggested that in many cases part-time faculty are better teachers than full-

time faculty because they have a more current perspective on the field, and they often bring a freshness to the classroom that is lacking in full-time faculty (Kekke, 1983). It is interesting that when evaluations of full-time and part-time faculty were compared in several different studies, no significant differences were found (Sworder, 1987). However, Sworder found that because students perceive that part-time faculty are less desirable than full-time faculty, they are less likely to enroll in classes taught by part-timers. The Conference on College Composition and Communication, in their "Statement of Principles and Standards for the Postsecondary Teaching of Writing," recommended that college writing programs replace part-time instructors with full-time tenured faculty members "who are both prepared for and committed to the teaching of writing" (Watkins, 1989). Again, this statement indicates a perception that part-time faculty who teach writing are somehow less prepared and less committed than full-time faculty.

Because of this concern about the quality of part-time faculty, the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office completed a study of part-time instruction in January, 1987. The study notes that part-time faculty in vocational fields bring specific expertise to the classroom which full-time faculty are less likely to have, although hard evidence was not provided in the study. Generally, full-time faculty were found to have higher academic credentials than part-time faculty, although part-timers held more professional degrees (California Community Colleges Office of the Chancellor, 1987, p.29). A similar study of Illinois community college part-timers also indicated that full-time faculty generally had higher academic degree attainment than part-time faculty (Illinois, 1987). However, a national study of part-time faculty in private two-year colleges indicated somewhat different results: 86 percent of the colleges reported that

their part-time faculty and full-time faculty had an equal amount of formal education (Smith, 1986).

In another comparison of full-time and part-time faculty which used data drawn from the Center for the Study of Community Colleges' surveys of humanities and science faculty (Friedlander, 1980), it was determined that full-time faculty had significantly more teaching experience than part-time faculty; full-time faculty had higher academic degree attainment; full-time faculty were more likely to use a variety of instructional media such as overheads, slides, and videotapes, (although many part-time faculty stated that they did not have access to media equipment); and full-time faculty were more involved in academic professional activities, including reading scholarly journals, attending professional meetings, and presenting papers at professional meetings. However, part-time faculty who teach in several different institutions often lack sufficient time for professional involvement. It should also be noted that this comparison of full-time and part-time did not include information about the currency or extent of involvement in the field of study for faculty in professional and vocational fields.

The selection process is an important determining factor in the quality of part-time faculty. Too often it becomes a last-minute process in which marginal candidates are hired. Those who hire part-time faculty should consider the candidates as carefully as if they were candidates for full-time positions, because once they are in the classroom there should be no difference in the quality of instruction for students. In order to select good candidates consistently, a systematic recruitment and hiring process must be organized which spells out specifically who initiates the hiring process, how long the search process takes, who interviews the prospective part-time faculty member, what are the criteria

for selection, how full-time faculty are involved in the process, and how much lead time must be given to the prospective part-time faculty member (Maher & Ebben, 1978).

The evaluation process is important in maintaining the quality of part-time faculty. It is critically important for the college and the department to communicate clear expectations of performance to all part-time faculty members (Maher & Ebben, 1978). In response to an article written by a part-time faculty member in Change magazine, Joseph Zelan, Dean of the School of Liberal and Professional Arts at John F. Kennedy University wrote, "We would never tolerate the lapses in professionalism described by Dr. Maitland. . . . The author's practice of having students debate an issue while she used the time to prepare for class and grade papers would be revealed by our class visits and by student feedback." Zelan concludes, "Institutions that permit their part-timers to engage in shoddy practices probably let their full-timers do so too. Part-time faculty do not deliver sub-standard instruction; sub-standard institutions do" (1987). It is the responsibility of the institution to provide an on-going system for the regular evaluation of all part-time faculty in order to ensure the quality of instruction provided by part-timers (Ernst & McFarlane, 1978). In addition, faculty development workshops on instructional methods should be made available on a regular basis for part-time faculty who wish to improve their teaching skills.

The quality of part-time faculty will continue to be debated, and incorrect perceptions about the quality of part-time faculty are not likely to disappear overnight. It is true that in quantitative comparisons of the qualifications of full-time and part-time faculty, the full-time faculty tend to be better qualified. However, in evaluations of part-time and full-time faculty, they appear to be evenly matched. Is it possible that the part-time faculty are actually more talented teachers because they somehow manage to do the same

quality of work as full-time faculty but with less formal preparation? In any event, to ensure a consistently high quality of instruction it is important for colleges to make the same serious commitment to the recruitment, hiring, evaluation, and development of part-time faculty as they have for full-time faculty.

Frustrations of Part-time Faculty.

Part-time faculty members may initially be excited about teaching a college class. However, many part-timers quickly become disillusioned. They are not a part of the mainstream of the college, they are paid less than full-time faculty, and they may even be perceived by some full-time faculty as inferior (Biles & Tuckman, 1986; Hairston, 1985; Quigley, 1986; Townsend, 1986; Flynn et al., 1986). Judith Gappa notes additional working conditions of part-time faculty which are likely to produce stress: absence of participation in decision-making, inadequate performance evaluation, last preference in workload and assignment, and job insecurity (1987). The 1986 AAUP report on non-tenure track appointments notes that part-time faculty "... find themselves frequently at the margins of departmental and institutional life. In many cases they are neither required nor expected -- and often not permitted -- to advise students, to play a role in faculty personnel and budget matters, or to participate in the development of curricula and the formulation and implementation of academic policy" (Heller, 1986, p.26).

In a 1978 meeting at New York University, one part-time faculty member summed up the poor working conditions (Scott, 1983, p. 189):

> "Each semester many of us must teach one or more courses at several institutions in order to accumulate a minimal living salary. Lack of institutional affiliation, numerous course preparations, and traveling from school to school inhibits our ability to actively participate in student and departmental affairs and further our own professional

> careers. Although most adjucts are fully qualified for full-time university positions, the job market in higher education has relegated us to an indeterminate position as 'academic piece-workers'."

Many part-time faculty have written about their poor working conditions in higher education publications as well as in major newspapers and news magazines. The focus of the majority of these articles is the issue of equitable pay. In a letter to the Los Angeles Times, nine part-time faculty members pointed out that part-time faculty are paid considerably less than full-time faculty, they must travel to several colleges to have a full teaching load, and they have little time for research or for making improvements in their courses (Dossett, et al., 1988). Roselle Lewis, a part-time English teacher at Valley College in Los Angeles since 1969 wrote that the revenue generated by part-time faculty is the same as the revenue generated by full-timers, yet those who teach part-time "subsidize our more fortunate colleagues, and the college district practices 'cost effective' education" (1989). In response, a letter to the editor notes the irony of a "two-tier" employment system in state-supported community colleges. The writer believes that such an inequitable system would be shut down immediately by the government and by unions if it were found in private industry (Jonsson, 1989).

Another common theme in articles written by part-time faculty is the lack of full-time positions and the difficulties associated with teaching in several institutions. In a study of part-time faculty satisfaction, Kuchera and Miller found that if the part-time faculty member perceives the full-time college market to be poor, he or she will have a lower level of commitment and will spend less time on the job (1988). However, some part-time faculty eventually gain full-time positions. Alice Roy, an assistant professor of English at California State University, Los Angeles, had been a "freeway flier" for five years before attaining her present tenure-track position. One semester she drove 80

miles a day to teach five classes at three different colleges (Bowen, 1987). An anthropology instructor who is now teaching full-time at Santa Monica College had taught up to seven courses a semester at three different colleges because there were no full-time positions available (Gordon, 1989). Unfortunately, these are not isolated cases, but two examples of a common working condition among one segment of part-time faculty: those who would like to teach full-time but have instead created full-time work by teaching at several institutions.

Christine Maitland has written several articles about the poor working conditions of part-time faculty in which she outlines clearly the difficulties of the "freeway fliers" who teach at several institutions (1987). In addition to the poor pay and job insecurity, she observes that each college has different policies and procedures, and different academic calenders which must be remembered by part-time faculty teaching at several institutions. Moreover, part-time faculty often spend a significant amount of time preparing for a course which may be cancelled at the beginning of the semester if enrollment is low (1989). Maitland recommends a seniority structure for part-time faculty to allow those whose classes have been cancelled the first right of refusal for other classes that are available.

In response to an article about the coming shortage of college professors which appeared in The Chronicle of Higher Education, two part-time faculty members wrote letters recommending that colleges and universities give top priority to existing part-timers when replacements are hired for the many full-time faculty who will be retiring soon. They reasoned that existing part-time faculty are experienced and well-qualified individuals who have a strong desire to teach. So it would make more sense for colleges to draw from this existing pool rather than trying to find other sources of full-time faculty

such as retirees or brand new graduate students (Bennett, 1990; Esbjornson, 1990). Another part-timer with 17 years of teaching experience notes, "Longtime part-time faculty with many valuable years of experience are ignored when full-time positions become available and are never told of such openings" (Friedman, 1989).

Finally, part-time faculty are concerned with their lack of status in the institution. Wilkie and Griesemen call them "The Hidden Professoriate" (1979). They observe that part-time faculty constitute a second professoriate who are "a loose aggregate of disparate individuals who can be observed on most campuses." A part-time English teacher notes that when she was a full-time replacement for one semester she was treated with respect and acceptance by other full-time faculty. But when she went back to teaching part-time the following semester she was ignored. She writes, "My former office mate who only the semester before had regaled me at length now barely twitched his mouth as we passed in the hall" (Birnberg, 1989). Another part-timer notes that when applying for full-time positions, the part-time status at that school "rather than enhancing him to full-time faculty, often carries instead a very real stigma of 'just' part-time, regardless of his expertise, experience, and commitment to that school" (Simar, 1989).

This lack of status is related to the inequitable treatment of part-time faculty. Abel calls them the "secondary workforce:" they receive lower pay, lack job security, have no means for promotion, and are the first to lose their jobs in lean times (1984). Beman points out that part-time faculty who do not perform satisfactorily are simply not hired again. But full-time tenured faculty who have become lax in their performance are usually not terminated. So part-time faculty are held to higher standards of performance than full-time faculty, simply because of their temporary status (1980). Institutions must consider this "inequitable treatment" seriously. In other words, perhaps the

standards for evaluation should be increased for tenured faculty to match the standards which are enforced on part-time faculty. If full-time faculty do not meet these standards, perhaps procedures for termination could be initiated by the institution.

What can institutions do to resolve some of the frustrations of part-time faculty? Judith Gappa offers five suggestions for colleges which would improve the working conditions: integrate part-time faculty more fully with full-time faculty to give them a sense of worth and belonging; provide equitable compensation; develop a clear evaluation system which aims to improve teaching effectiveness; provide opportunities to participate more fully in departmental decision-making; and provide some job security for different categories of part-time faculty (1987, p. 41). A part-time English teacher recommends that institutions allow part-timers to teach several courses at the same institution so that they might qualify for equitable pay and benefits if not tenure (Delehant, 1989). Finally, an administrator recommends that colleges provide equitable pay and status for part-timers who have been certificated by the institution after a three-year probationary period similar to the probationary period for full-time faculty (Arden, 1989). In general, colleges should make a serious attempt to resolve the frustrations of part-time faculty if they want to retain a well-qualified and well-satisfied group of part-timers. For this reason, and for ethical reasons, colleges should consider the equitable treatment of part-time faculty as a part of their normal operating procedures.

Management of Part-time Faculty

It is no secret that it requires more time and energy to manage many part-timers than to manage a few full-timers. In addition, part-time faculty usually have a high turnover rate, which means orienting a significant number of new part-time faculty each semester. Finally, because of the high turnover, there is an increased need to recruit new part-time

faculty, which also involves significant management time. So, in reality how much money is being saved by hiring many part-time faculty when management time is considered? David Leslie (1989), director of the Institute for Studies in Higher Education at Florida State University, recommends that institutions whose objective is maintaining or improving quality should carefully analyze the management overhead inherent in the use of large numbers of part-time faculty.

One recommended method for managing part-time faculty is a mentoring program in which full-time faculty are teamed with part-time faculty to provide assistance and informal evaluations throughout the semester (Nolan, 1988). Although it takes some time and effort to organize a mentoring program and to train the mentors, the long-term benefits to the institution and to the individual part-time faculty members can be substantial. In addition, faculty mentors reduce the amount of supervision required by the department chair or a campus administrator, while providing greater individual attention.

Another management model recommends the appointment of an administrative position for the supervision of all part-time faculty (Carson, 1988). This administrator would have the responsibility for orienting part-time faculty, providing instructional workshops for part-time faculty, and facilitating communication with part-time faculty. In addition, the administrative supervisor of part-time faculty could relieve the load of the department chairs by taking some responsibility for recruiting, hiring, scheduling, and evaluating part-time faculty. However, in most cases it would probably be necessary for the department chair to continue to be actively involved in these processes because of the content knowledge which is often required to effectively hire and evaluate faculty.

Donald Grieve, a well-respected consultant in the area of part-time faculty management, offers several suggestions for those who manage part-time faculty (1988).

First, Grieve recommends that part-time faculty managers should be assertive in establishing the importance of part-time faculty and in being an advocate for part-time evening students. It is important to insist on the availability of full services for faculty who teach in the evening and for students who attend classes in the evening. At the same time, Grieve notes that it is risky to become politically involved in issues of salary and faculty rights for part-time faculty. Second, he recommends an organized, systematic approach to the recruitment and hiring of part-time faculty in order to take the time to hire good quality faculty and to avoid "panic hiring" right before the start of the semester. Third, Grieve believes that it is important to have a good working relationship with the department chairs in order to effectively implement the goals and strategies for the management of part-time faculty. Finally, he recommends that the office of the college Manager of Part-time Faculty should provide direct support to part-time faculty through printed materials and an on-going series of faculty development activities.

Those who manage part-time faculty may be department chairs who are responsible for part-timers in their department, or managers of part-time faculty for an entire college. Although it is time-consuming to manage part-time faculty, it is important for colleges to recognize the importance of good management practices by providing extra support especially for part-time faculty. The extra attention and courtesy given to part-time faculty will result in increased morale and will probably lead to the retention of high quality part-time faculty. Through effective management practices, the college will benefit by reduced management costs in the recruitment, hiring, and orientation of part-time faculty if high quality part-time faculty are retained.

Integration & Involvement.

One of the common complaints about part-time faculty members is that they are rarely on campus: they come only to teach their classes. Part of the problem is that most part-time faculty members are not required to hold office hours, and many have no offices. Moreover, there is often a lack of time due to multiple commitments. The Houston Community College System (HCCS) was concerned about the lack of involvement of its part-time faculty which constituted 75 percent of the total faculty. A survey of the part-time faculty members revealed that they were interested in further contact and development (Brams, 1983, p.39). This would seem to indicate that despite the barriers, part-time faculty are interested in becoming more involved with the college.

Colleges must make decisions about the extent of involvement of part-time faculty, and then make their expectations clear. Are they expected to be involved in departmental affairs, such as curriculum development, departmental governance, committee work, and student advisement? If part-time faculty are willing to take on these additional responsibilities, they may also expect additional compensation (Tucker, 1984). Vaughan (1986) recommends that colleges encourage those hoping for a full-time teaching position to become more involved in the department curricula meetings and in campus committees. These forms of involvement integrate the part-time faculty member more fully into the college, and may provide fresh input for the department and for the college. The only danger is that an increased level of involvement may result in unrealistic expectations, and ultimately a higher level of frustration for those who are hoping for full-time positions. However, increased involvement in departmental and college decision-making activities is likely to result in a more positive climate for part-time

faculty because their opinions would count and they would be treated as full, rather than peripheral, members of the college community (Greenwood, 1980).

Involvement of part-time faculty members may also be accomplished through increased communication. In its part-time faculty development program, Hagerstown Junior College in Maryland includes workshops, campus tours, and interview sessions which are intended to open the lines of communication between part-time faculty members, the full-time faculty, and administrators. The part-time faculty of Hagerstown are also provided with a weekly information bulletin which includes the names of administrators and counselors who are on duty in the evening that particular week (Parsons, 1980). Opportunities for increased communication give part-time faculty the opportunity to conveniently ask questions or solve problems.

To improve the quality of performance of part-time faculty, they should be integrated into the mainstream of the college. If part-time faculty are more fully integrated and involved in the college, student retention may increase. Essex Community College in Maryland discovered that high student attrition was related to the fact that part-time faculty were not using all of the college resources that were available. Because they were not able to refer students with problems to appropriate campus offices to get help or information, some students may dropped out (Albert & Watson, 1980). Truckee Meadows Community College in Reno, Nevada solved a similar problem by providing all part-time faculty with detailed information on the availability of student services in order to assist them in helping to meet the needs of the students. In a part-time faculty workshop, a special session includes information on meeting the unique needs of various student populations. In addition, all part-time faculty are given a tour of the student development

complex to better acquaint them with the services available for students (Davidson, 1983).

Another method which may increase the involvement of part-time faculty is extending a special invitation to part-time faculty for all-campus or department events, including faculty meetings, special events, holiday parties, luncheons or dinners, lectures, and cultural and athletic events. In addition, meetings could be held several times each year which bring the college administration, department chairs, and part-time faculty together for the specific purpose of discussing campus issues and other issues of importance to the part-time faculty (Ginsburg, 1988).

The implications for colleges are clear. Many studies have shown that part-time faculty want more involvement. If part-time faculty are integrated more fully into the college, it is likely that the quality of instruction may increase, student retention may be positively affected, and the attitude of the part-time faculty is likely to be better if they are treated as an important part of the operation of the college. For many reasons, it is in the best interest of the college to find ways of more fully integrating and involving part-time faculty.

Development of Part-time faculty.

Colleges should realize that they are likely to reap many benefits if they provide faculty development opportunities for their part-time faculty. In addition to increasing the instructional skills of part-time faculty, the workshops are likely to cause greater involvement and communication But it is also important to look at faculty development from the part-timer's point of view. A college with a good program of faculty development may be considered as a more desirable college, and faculty development opportunities are likely to be "perks" for those who want to enhance their careers. Michael S. Cain,

associate professor of English at Catonsville Community College in Maryland makes this point effectively: "Adjunct faculty have a stake in their own development. Seeking to further their own personal and professional growth, they recognize that continued increases in professionalism will benefit them. Development, then, does not need to be forced; it needs only to be available" (1988). Unfortunately, previous studies have indicated that part-time faculty are usually not included in faculty development activities (Peterson, 1982).

However, the literature is rich with articles which make recommendations about the need for an on-going program of faculty development for part-time faculty. Usually exemplary programs are cited as examples. In general, two basic themes emerge: the need for a strong orientation program which includes a handbook for part-time faculty, and the desirability of an on-going program of instructional skills workshops.

First, part-time faculty require a thorough orientation to the philosophies, policies, practices, and procedures of the college. Sheri Bidwell, assistant to the Vice President for Academic Affairs at Columbus State Community College in Ohio believes in the importance of a strong orientation program for part-time faculty, because if part-time faculty are not well oriented enrollment is likely to be adversely affected. Bidwell stated at a conference on part-time faculty, "I truly believe that unless we orient our faculty, support them, and give them the skills they need to succeed in the classroom, then our students don't keep coming back"(1988). Topics for a thorough part-time faculty orientation include basic procedures such as roll-keeping and how to drop and add students, administrative contacts at the college, and teaching tips (Biles and Tuckman, 1986, pp. 129-132). Results of a survey of part-time faculty members at 53 colleges which belong to the League for Innovation in Community Colleges revealed that most part-

time faculty are interested in receiving more information about "nitty gritty" college procedures, such as faculty evaluation standards, adult students, and the possibility of obtaining a full-time position (McMillen, 1986; Williams, 1985). In a study of part-time faculty in Clark County Community College, Nevada, Pedras found that, in addition to standard policies and procedures, new part-time faculty also need to be oriented to the mission of the college and need to gain a clear understanding of the legal aspects of dealing with students (1982). Each college may want to supplement these topics with current issues or problems which are local in nature.

In the Houston Community College District (HCCS), a survey of part-time faculty revealed that they would be willing to devote some additional time to faculty development activities. Based on the results of a needs assessment, the first projects were the production of an orientation videotape and a series of travelling workshops on instructional techniques. In addition, an "HCCS Survival Six-Pack" was developed for the part-time faculty. The "Six Pack" included printed materials on the following topics: General Orientation, Essential Policies and Procedures, Teaching Adult Learners, College Communication, Student Services, and Professional Responsibilities, Evaluation, and Growth (Brams, 1983, p.42).

Judith McGaughey (1986), dean of adult and continuing education at LaGuardia Community College in New York also suggests making an orientation videotape available to new and part-time faculty members before the start of the new semester. Faculty members may check out the videotape and view it at home prior to the start of the new semester. Such a videotape would supplement , not replace, printed materials.

Frequently colleges assume that anyone with an M.A. or Ph.D. can teach. However, this is not always true. A full professional development program for part-time faculty should

include the basics of college teaching: syllabus writing, lecturing, leading discussions, designing individualized learning experiences, and designing and evaluating tests of various types. Boyar and MacKenzie recommend giving new part-time faculty copies of excellent course syllabi as models (1987). Maguire suggests that at the department level, full-time faculty could create very detailed course outlines with more descriptive class objectives, methods, and assignments to share with part-timers. This would be one method of helping a new part-time faculty member to develop a good plan for the semester which could be transformed into a very effective and detailed syllabus (1983).

A list of suggested competencies for part-time teachers of adults was developed by the Center for Resource Development in Adult Education at the University of Missouri in Kansas City. The following are a few of the twenty-four recommended competencies which may be addressed through faculty development workshops: effective communication skills, knowing how to create a positive learning environment, adjusting teaching to accomodate individual and group characteristics, maintaining the learners' interest, providing continuous feedback to learners, and relating classroom activities to the experiences of learners (Mocker & Noble, 1981). The University of Maryland's University College helps part-time faculty members through a program which includes many of the above competencies. In addition to teaching methods, they emphasize developing skills to meet the special needs of adult learners (Mangan, 1987).

Brams (1983) suggests that, based on the results of the HCCS study, part-timers are eager to learn, but have limited time. Therefore, faculty development activities for part-time faculty must be short, convenient, and relevent. Hinds Junior College in Mississippi addressed the special needs and limited time of part-time faculty members by developing four one-day modules which focus on teaching techniques and curriculum development.

Part-time faculty members participate one day each semester for four semesters (Palmer, 1986). A similar program is offered by Burlington County College in New Jersey. Part-time faculty attend an "institute" for five, three-hour sessions on sequential Saturday mornings. Workshops are facilitated by experienced full-time faculty. Burlington provides two incentives for attending the institute: first, a stipend is paid for completing the required work and for attending all sessions; and second, completion of the institute meets one of the requisites for advancement on the salary schedule (Pierce & Miller, 1980). It has been found that spreading the workshops over a longer period of time gives faculty members a better opportunity to absorb the material and a chance to use what they've learned before the next workshop (Rabalais & Perritt, 1983).

Another method for ensuring good teaching skills in new part-time faculty members is a mentoring program similar to the ones used by Vista College and Los Mendenos College, two community colleges in California, (Palmer, 1986; Elloff, 1983; California Post-Secondary Commission, 1987), and University College in Cincinnati, Ohio (Napoli, 1988). In all of the mentoring programs, experienced faculty (usually full-time) are teamed with new part-time faculty to provide assistance and guidance as needed. Vista College is a noncampus community college in California whose teaching staff consists primarily of part-time faculty. At Vista, the most experienced part-time faculty members assist new faculty members by conducting workshops on all aspects of teaching and learning and by providing individualized assistance to new part-time faculty.

In addition to the mentoring program, Los Mendenos College has an extensive program of professional development activities specifically for part-time faculty, including sabbaticals, workshops, conferences, and travel grants. Each year part-time faculty at

Los Mendanos participate in a total of nine days of faculty development activities based around a common theme (California Post Secondary Commission, 1987). This is an exemplary program which indicates a strong commitment to the professional development of part-time faculty.

With the advent of California Assembly Bill 1725, funding is now provided to all California community colleges for the specific purpose of staff development for administrators, full-time and part-time faculty, and classified staff. Five million dollars were distributed among the 106 California Community Colleges in 1988/89, and again in 1989/90. A study of the faculty development in California commnity colleges before the A.B. 1725 funding indicated that many of the programs and workshops were planned and facilitated by members of the faculty for presentation to their colleagues. Faculty generally received grants or released time to work on staff development activities (Berman, Weiler Associates, 1987). The first evaluation of the effect of A.B. 1725 on staff development (Alfano, et al., 1990) indicated that the additional funding has enabled colleges to expand the staff development activities that had been underway before the funding. In addition, many colleges have added more activities, funded additional sabbaticals, and expanded staff development activities to include part-time faculty. At this time it expected that the A.B. 1725 funding for staff development in the community colleges will continue and may be increased in the future. In California, this new funding has provided an incentive for the expansion of development activities which might allow community colleges to set up an extensive staff development program specifically for part-time faculty similar to that which exists at Los Mendanos College.

In summary, colleges should provide a good program of orientation for part-time faculty so they may become familiar with the college before they begin teaching. In

addition, colleges should plan a series of instructional skills workshops for part-time faculty who may have had little or no previous teaching experience, or for those who simply want to improve their teaching skills. In planning such workshops, it is important to consider the schedules of part-time faculty. It is best to offer faculty development workshops at intervals throughout the semester so instructors have an opportunity to use what they learn during the semester. In addition to providing opportunities for part-time faculty to gain new teaching skills, faculty development workshops provide an opportunity to meet other faculty and to gain a stronger sense of involvement with the college.

Policy Issues and Recommendations

Why should colleges be concerned with adopting policies which enhance the position of part-time faculty? First, it is likely that part-time faculty will continue to teach a significant proportion of classes in community colleges, particularly in subject areas which require current content expertise in a professional field. Second, it is likely that many college students, especially the adult student population in evening classes, receive their first exposure to the college or to a subject area from a part-time instructor (Plante, 1987). If colleges acknowledge these two realities, they will realize the importance of formulating policies to ensure the quality of part-time faculty through careful recruiting and evaluation. In order to recruit and retain high quality part-time faculty, policies must also be formulated which provide greater respect and support to part-time faculty.

In a study of part-time faculty in the California community colleges, Katrin Spinetta (1990) examined the effects of the employment of large numbers of part-time faculty on department coordination, curriculum development, quality of instruction, student

advising, and other teaching responsibilities. This study found that several "model" districts had contributed to the professionalization of part-time faculty through recognition, status upgrading, participation in departmental decision-making, and faculty development. This resulted in improved satisfaction, morale, and effectiveness among part-time faculty in these districts. Spinetta recommends the following policies: the California Education Code should be amended to include a new classification of permanent part-time faculty who have all of the rights, responsibilities, and privileges of full-time faculty on a pro-rata basis; efforts should be made to improve the wage disparity between full-time and part-time faculty; and collective bargaining units should include representation of part-time faculty.

In California, the Master Plan Review Commission recommended that districts employ faculty who teach six or more units on a contract basis. The Joint Legislative Committee on the Master Plan proposed a pilot test of two year "rolling contracts" for part-time faculty who would have the same responsibilities as full-time faculty, including advising students and developing curricula. California Assembly Bill 1725 includes an appropriation of $52.8 million for three years, from 1987 through 1990, to encourage districts to reduce their dependence on part-time faculty. By 1990 all districts should have used these funds to convert part-time positions to full-time positions so that full-time instructors would be teaching 75 percent of the class hours. In addition, the California Community Colleges Board of Governors proposed several new policies which address additional support for part-time faculty, including programs of institutional orientation, professional development activities, mentoring programs, departmental clerical support, and full pro-rata compensation for part-time faculty who have the same

responsibilities as full-time faculty (California Community Colleges Board of Governors, 1987).

The National Education Association (1988) adopted a policy resolution in 1986 which is similar to the California policies:

> The National Education Association believes that part-time faculty should be employed only when an educational program requires specialized training or expertise not available in the full-time faculty and when the need for such training and expertise does not justify more than half-time employment. Part-time faculty should receive the same salary and fringe benefits as full-time faculty prorated according to the workload. The Association also believes that part-time faculty should not be employed for the primary purpose of reducing instructional budgets or for the purpose of reducing the number of full-time faculty positions.

In addition, the NEA also advocates the same academic due process rights which are granted to full-time faculty, including timely written notice of reappointment, the right to file grievances, equitable peer evaluations, and some form of employment security after an appropriate probationary period.

Collective bargaining has been seen as a way for part-time faculty to gain some of desired rights and privileges, as well as an equitable pay structure. However, as Howard Tuckman notes, "Increases for part-timers are perceived as opposite to the interests of full-timers" (Heller, 1987). For this reason, full-time faculty are not likely to include part-time faculty in their own collective bargaining units. At several four-year colleges, part-time faculty have successfully organized into a collective bargaining unit which is separate from the union for full-time faculty. In 1986 the part-time faculty of the entire University of California system signed its first contract to represent over 25 hundred lecturers, adjunct professors, and temporary faculty members. Marde Gregory, a union leader and instructor at UCLA believes that it is much better for part-time faculty to bargain separately (Heller, 1987). Although bargaining units specifically for part-

time faculty have some advantages, it is a tremendous challenge to attempt to organize a group which has no offices, diverse interests, and may not be teaching in the same institution from one semester to the next. A study of campus unions done by the National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education at Baruch College in New York revealed that the number of newly organized adjunct faculty bargaining units had increased significantly between 1983 and 1987 (Douglas, 1988). This growth in unionization is attributed to several factors. First, part-time faculty started to recognize that they were not represented by unions for full-time faculty. Second, academic unionists recognized that part-timers were ripe for unionization. And third, the character of part-time faculty has changed to include a significant number whose only employment is part-time teaching, usually in several institutions. These faculty are more interested in increased teaching loads, increased job security, better pay, and the availability of health insurance and other benefits than those who work full-time elsewhere.

In general, there are a number of movements to change policies in order to increase the status, pay, and rights for part-time faculty. Legislative bodies, individual colleges, and unions are all likely to have an impact on these issues in the future.

Conclusion

The review of the literature points to some important trends in the use of part-time faculty. The number of part-time faculty is continuing to grow. Although most part-time faculty teach because they enjoy teaching, many teach part-time at several institutions because they have been unable to find a full-time teaching position. One of the major advantages of using part-time faculty is the fact that they are content experts who often bring a very current perspective to a class. However, the disadvantages include poor

working conditions, and extra management time. Although the degree attainment of part-time faculty is generally lower than full-time faculty, student evaluation of teaching is about the same for both groups. Still, there are nagging doubts among many full-time faculty and administrators that part-time faculty are somehow "lower quality" faculty. As a result, part-time faculty feel many frustrations associated with this "second-class status," including poor treatment by full-time faculty, poor pay, lack of job security, lack of opportunities for involvement, and the lack of full-time positions. Those who manage part-time faculty also face numerous frustrations: the extra time which is taken up with recruiting and orienting new part-timers each semester, as well as the extra time spent in supervising and evaluating many part-time faculty rather than a few full-time faculty. Faculty development may provide some solutions for the frustrations of both the part-time faculty and those who manage part-time faculty. Orientation programs, mentoring programs, and an on-going program of instructional workshops are likely to absorb some of the management load while enhancing the quality of part-time faculty and integrating part-time faculty more fully into the institution. Finally, colleges, districts, and states should consider policies which will improve the working conditions and resolve the frustrations if they are interested in attracting and retaining a high-quality pool of part-time faculty. This is the concept of the human resources development approach to part-time faculty: recognizing the value of part-time faculty by improving the working conditions and by providing opportunities for professional growth and development.

Methodology

The data used in this study were gathered during the Fall semester, 1988, at Fullerton College, a large suburban community college in Southern California with a student population of about 20,000, a full-time faculty of approximately 300, and a part-time faculty of approximately 375 to 400 each semester. The entire population of 432 Fullerton College part-time faculty was surveyed. However, within the first two weeks of the semester it is normal for many classes to be cancelled due to low enrollment. Many part-time faculty who had been scheduled to teach classes often find that they do not have a class to teach if the enrollment for their class falls below sixty percent of the predetermined class size. Or, if classes of full-time faculty are cancelled, full-time faculty members will often need to take over evening classes from part-time faculty members in order to fill out their full teaching load. For this reason, the population of part-time faculty was ultimately reduced to 371 by the second week of the semester. Surveys which were returned by those whose classes were cancelled were discarded.

The survey was administered at the part-time faculty meeting at the beginning of the semester on August 16, 1988. Surveys were sent through the campus mail to the part-time faculty who did not attend the meeting. The majority of the surveys was collected at the end of the meeting and during the first two weeks of the semester. Two weeks after the initial meeting, on August 30, a reminder notice was sent to all part-time faculty members who had not yet returned their surveys. A second reminder notice with a second copy of the survey was sent two weeks later on September 13 to those who had not returned the surveys. A third reminder notice with a third copy of the survey was sent one month later on October 12. Finally, a fourth reminder notice was sent with a fourth copy of the survey on November 14. (See Appendix A for reminder notices.) By December

9, near the end of the semester, a total of 314 surveys had been completed and returned, for a return rate of slightly over 84 percent.

The Survey Instrument

The survey instrument (see Appendix A) included five sections which measured teaching methods used, interest in faculty development, involvement in the college and in the division, professional involvement in the field and in teaching, and demographic characteristics.

The variety and scope of teaching methods used by part-time faculty were measured in the first section. In addition, this section also measured the variety of methods used to evaluate student work and the amount of information provided about the class to students at the beginning of the semester.

The purpose of the second part of the survey was to measure the level of interest in faculty development activities, including possible topics for faculty workshops, the best times to offer faculty workshops, the desirability of a booklet for part-time faculty, and the information that would have been helpful to know when starting to teach at Fullerton College. Interest in faculty development was measured to determine if it would be worthwhile for the college to provide activities specifically for part-time faculty.

The third section measured the involvement and communication of the part-time faculty, including how frequently part-timers talked to the division dean and to other division faculty, the amount of guidence they received from the division dean and faculty when they were new, how frequently they attend division meetings, the feelings of involvement with the division and with the college, and the desire for greater involvement. From this information an involvement profile of the part-time faculty could be developed to show how involved they are, and how involved they would like to be.

Professional characteristics were measured in the fourth section to determine the length and depth of teaching experience at Fullerton College and in other schools and colleges; for faculty in vocational subjects, the length and currency of experience in their professional fields; and the extent of the outside commitments of part-time faculty. Teaching background at Fullerton College was measured with the following variables: number of years teaching at Fullerton College, teaching primarily day or evening classes, age of students taught, number of hours per week teaching at Fullerton College, number of different classes taught, number of students taught, desire for a full-time position, and teaching in a vocational or academic subject area. The professional experience of those teaching in vocational areas was measured with their current involvement in the field and number of years spent working in the field. The outside teaching commitments were measured with the following variables: part-time teaching, full-time teaching, total number of hours per week teaching (in addition to Fullerton College), number of different classes taught, and number of students taught. From this information a professional profile of the part-time faculty members could be developed which would indicate both teaching background and professional experience.

Finally, age, gender, and educational level were measured in the fifth section of the survey. A demographic profile of the part-time faculty could then be compared with the same characteristics of the full-time faculty of Fullerton College. In addition, these variables were measured so that they might used in the analysis of other variables.

Analysis of the Data

In the preliminary data analysis, the frequencies were tabulated for each variable (See Appendix B). Professional involvement in the field was tabulated only for those who were teaching in vocational subject areas. Involvement variables were tabulated only for

those who were not new faculty members, because those teaching for the first time in the Fall 1988 semester had not yet had an opportunity for involvement.

Nine structural characteristics of part-time faculty were used for a further analysis of the data which included chi square analysis, discriminant analysis, multiple regression analysis, and t-tests. The first two structural characteristics, Division type and length of teaching, had multiple categories which were mutually exclusive. Three of the structural characteristics were dichotomies: vocational or academic; male or female; and day or evening. The four remaining characteristics indicated whether or not part-timers classified themselves as Hopeful Full-timers, Moonlighters, Full-time Teachers, and Freeway Fliers. These four were dichotomies, not mutually exclusive groups.

1. Division type. Fullerton College has thirteen academic divisions which were grouped into five "division types" for this study. "Math and Science" includes three divisions: Mathematics, Biological Sciences, and Physical Sciences. "Career" divisions are those which are both academic and vocational: students in these programs usually transfer to four-year colleges to continue their studies, but they are often able to begin work in the field with a two-year degree or certificate. "Career" divisions include Communications (Radio/Television, Journalism, Public Relations, Photography), Fine Arts (Theater Arts, Music, Art), Home Economics (Child Development, Nutrition, Interior Design, Fashion Merchandising), Library Science, Physical Education, and Student Development (Career education). "Liberal Arts" includes two divisions: Humanities (English, Speech, Foreign Languages), and Social Sciences (History, Philosophy, Psychology, Economics). Two divisions, "Business" and "Vocational and Technical Education" were not combined with any others because they each have a large contingent of part-time faculty, and each is quite specific in purpose. The Business

Division provides students with skills in computer science, accounting, marketing, and management which have direct business applications. Students in Vocational and Technical Education learn trades for direct employment, including cosmetology, automotive service, construction, electronics, and drafting.

2. Length of teaching. The following increments were used in measuring the length of time teaching at Fullerton College: first semester (brand new faculty), up to one year of teaching completed, two to five years of teaching completed, six to ten years of teaching completed, and over ten years of teaching completed. In the analysis of the involvement variables, only the high (over ten years) and low (up to one year) were used.

3. Hopeful Full-timers. This group includes part-time faculty who answered "yes" to the survey question "Do you hope to eventually teach full-time?"

4. Vocational and Academic. Respondents categorized themselves as "Vocational" or "Academic" faculty by responding to the question, "Do you teach in a primarily vocational subject or a primarily academic subject?"

5. Males and Females. Demographic information was requested in the survey.

6. Day and Evening. Part-time faculty who responded that they teach day classes or day and evening classes were classified as "Day" faculty. Those who responded that they teach only in the evening were classified as "Evening" faculty.

7. Moonlighters. Respondents who said that they are currently working full-time in their profession were classified as "Moonlighters." This category does not include those who teach full-time.

8. Full-time teachers. This category includes those who teach full-time at another institution: high school, another two-year college, or a four-year college.

9. Freeway fliers. Those who teach part-time in at least one other college, two-year or four-year, were classified as "Freeway Fliers."

First, chi-square analysis was used to determine significant relationships between the nine structural characteristics of the part-time faculty and the following twelve involvement variables (for those who were not new faculty members).

Involvement Variables

- frequency of conversations with division dean
- frequency of conversations with department chair
- frequency of conversations with other faculty members
- desire to meet more faculty
- when new, having received good guidance from a full-time faculty member
- when new, having received good guidance from the dean or department chair
- regular memos from the division dean or department chair
- attendence at division or department meetings
- feelings of involvement with the college
- feelings of involvement with the division or department
- desire for greater involvement with the college
- desire for greater involvement with the division or department

Multiple regression analysis was then used to determine which of the twelve involvement variables were the strongest predictors of eight of the nine part-time profile variables. Because division type is nominal data, it was analyzed with discriminant analysis rather than multiple regression.

The same nine structural characteristics of part-time faculty were analyzed by using the following twelve professional profile variables. First, chi-square analysis was used to

find significant relationships, then multiple regression analysis was used for all characteristics except division type. Discriminant analysis was again used in analyzing division type with the professional profile variables.

Professional Profile Variables

- number of years of part-time teaching at the college
- teaching day or evening classes
- number of hours of teaching per week during the Fall semester
- number of different classes taught during the Fall semester
- hoping to teach full-time
- teaching in a vocational or academic discipline
- current full-time employment in the profession
- current full-time teaching in another institution
- current part-time teaching in other institutions
- age
- gender
- highest degree earned

Chi square analysis was also used to determine if significant relationships existed among the following involvement variables for faculty who were not new:

- feelings of involvement with the college and feelings of involvement with the division
- desire for greater involvement with the college and desire for greater involvement with the division
- current involvement with the college and desire for greater involvement with the college

- current involvement with the division and desire for greater involvement with the division
- desire to meet more faculty and desire for greater involvement with the college
- desire to meet more faculty and desire for greater involvement with the division

Multiple regression analysis was also used to predict the four following involvement variables with all other involvement variables: current involvement with the division and with the college, and desire for greater involvement with the division and with the college.

Chi square analysis was used to determine if any significant relationships existed between receiving good guidance as a new faculty member from the division dean or department chair and the involvement variables.

Two multiple regressions were used to predict the number of teaching hours with the involvement variables and the professional profile variables. T-tests were also used to compare the mean number of hours taught at Fullerton College with all characteristics except division type. Finally, T-tests were used to compare the mean number of teaching hours with the four involvement variables: current involvement with the division and with the college, and desire for greater involvement with the division and with the college.

Results

The detailed results of the frequency analysis are in Appendix B. Results of the statistical analyses may be found in the tables in Appendix C.

Frequencies

The part-time faculty at Fullerton College may be characterized by the following demographic attributes: nearly seventy percent are between the ages of 30 and 49, nearly 60 percent are male, and over sixty-six percent have a master's degree or doctorate. Of those who classified themselves as "Academic" faculty, over 65 percent have a master's degree, and over 22 percent hold a doctorate.

The division with the greatest number of part-time faculty at Fullerton College is the Business Division with over 26 percent of the part-time faculty, followed by Humanities with nearly 16 percent, Technical Education with 13 percent, Fine Arts with nearly 10 percent, Social Sciences with nine and a half percent, and Math with slightly over nine percent. These divisions represent the two major vocational education areas, and the four major General Education academic fields. The divisions which employ the smallest number of part-time faculty are the Library, Student Development, Physical Sciences, and Biological Sciences. According to their own self-classification, 40 percent of the part-timers teach in primarily vocational fields, and 60 percent teach primarily academic subjects.

Although part-time faculty use a variety of teaching methods, the most popular method by far is the traditional lecture, which is used by over 93 percent of part-time faculty. Class discussions are used by nearly three quarters of part-timers. Question and answer review of material and hands-on activities are each used by over half of the part-time faculty. About one third of the part-timers use each of the following teaching

methods: small group discussions, overhead transparencies, videotapes, and writing activities during class. Less than ten percent use computer-aided instruction.

Of all of the forms of evaluation used by part-time faculty in grading students, student attendance was the most frequently used evaulation, used by over seventy percent. Nearly two thirds of the part-timers used the following three forms of student evaulation: a cumulative final examination, class participation, and multiple choice tests. About half used midterm exams and short answer tests. Over one third used the following forms of evaluation: penalties for missed deadlines for assignments, true-false tests, fill-in tests, and essay tests. About one quarter of the part-time faculty use lab projects in class, graded in-class writing assignments, and regular writing assignments. Written reports without footnotes or bibliography were used by 22 percent, and formal research papers with footnotes and bibliography were used by only slightly over 10 percent. Oral reports in class were used by nearly twenty percent, and formal speeches in class were used by less than five percent.

Almost 97 percent of part-time faculty give their students a course outline or syllabus at the beginning of the semester, nearly 94 percent provide grading criteria for their students, and over 63 percent provide a week-by-week class schedule. In addition, over one fifth of the part-time faculty also give their students additional handouts, including student questionaires, assignment lists, lists of required materials, lab requirements, and additional class material.

Part-time faculty showed interest in a variety of potential staff development topics. They appeared to have the greatest interest in topics related to the improvement of teaching. Over 45 percent would like a workshop on motivational techniques for the classroom. About one third were interested in each of the following topics related to

instruction: how to incorporate new teaching methods, general college teaching techniques, increasing student retention, and teaching underprepared students. Over half responded favorably to the idea of holding staff development workshops on non-teaching weekday evenings, and over 40 percent would like such workshops on Saturday mornings. Almost half would like workshops during the fall semester, nearly 40 percent prefer workshops to be before the start of the spring semester or during the spring semester, and about one third would like workshops to be held before the start of the fall semester. In addition, over 82 percent felt that an information booklet would be helpful.

In an open-ended question in which part-time faculty were asked to state "what didn't you know that you wished you had known from the beginning," slightly over 4 percent responded that they were very satisfied with the orientation they had received. Almost 20 percent would like to have known more about college policies and procedures, and five percent wanted more information on department policies and procedures. Slightly over ten percent would have liked more information on teaching techniques. About ten percent would like to have known more about the working conditions, including the lack of full-time teaching opportunities, the salary schedule and pay increases, the high drop-out rate, and the number of underprepared students. Over five percent wanted to know more about the availbility of teaching assistance, including clerical help for typing and duplication and the availability of audio-visual materials and equipment. About four percent noted that they could have used some basic information about the college, including a map, parking instructions, a class schedule and catalog, and information about services available to evening students. A few part-time faculty mentioned that they would like more information about the terms of academia and how to market college classes.

How often and how much do part-time faculty communicate with others on campus? Tabulations for faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was administered revealed the following information. Over one quarter of the part-time faculty talk to their division deans once a month, and about 17 percent talk once per week. However, 28 percent talk to their department chairs once per week, and 29 percent talk once per month. Over half talk to other faculty in the division once per week, but 37 percent seldom talk to faculty from other divisions. Over half of the part-time faculty would like to meet more faculty.

Guidance for the majority of part-time faculty when they were new came from the Division Dean or a full-time faculty member, and only occasionally from another part-time faculty member.

How involved are part-time faculty (who are not new) in their departments or divisions? Over 87 percent receive regular memos from their division deans, but over 82 percent do not attend division meetings. Most do not attend because they are unavailable when the meetings are held. About 72 percent feel "somewhat involved" or "slightly involved" with Fullerton College and with their divisions. Over 20 percent feel strongly involved with their divisions and over 15 percent feel strongly involved with Fullerton College. The majority of part-time faculty, over 60 percent, are interested in greater involvement with their divisions and with Fullerton College.

In an open-ended question, all part-time faculty were asked, "What could Fullerton College or your division do to make your job as a part-time instructor better?" Almost twelve percent responded that they were very satisfied with Fullerton College. However, about 43 percent of the part-time faculty had a variety of suggestions for improvement. Slightly less than six percent stated that they would like an increase in salary and

benefits, and another six percent would like office space. Over five percent stated that they would like more teaching hours or a full-time position. Less than five percent mentioned that they would like to feel as if they were more a part of the team through greater recognition and being included in division activities. Four and a half percent said specifically that they would like to be included in departmental meetings and in departmental curriculum decisions and planning. About three and a half percent felt that more communication was needed, and that staff development activities would be helpful.

Over 17 percent of the part-time faculty were new to Fullerton College this semester, about 19 percent had been teaching at Fullerton College one semester to one year, and over 26 percent had been at Fullerton for six to fifteen years. Seventy-three percent teach in the evening only, and 98 percent teach in one division. Thirty-six percent teach students between the ages of 18 and 25, and over 26 percent teach students between the ages of 18 and 45. The mean number of hours taught by each part-time faculty member is 5.71 hours, and each part-time faculty member teaches between one and two classes. Altogether, part-time faculty teach a total of approximately 12,000 students. Most part-time faculty, nearly 60 percent, teach between 20 and 50 students each semester.

Slightly over half of the part-time faculty, about 56 percent, would like a full-time teaching position at any college. Over one third of the part-time faculty hope to teach full-time at Fullerton College.

Of the vocational faculty, over 85 percent are currently working in the profession in which they teach: over 58 percent work full-time, nearly 18 percent work part-time, and nearly 9 percent do freelance work in their profession. Nearly 90 percent of the vocational faculty have worked full-time in their field, and less than two percent have never worked in their field. Of the 18 vocational faculty who are not currently working

in the profession, three stopped working a year ago, two each stopped working two, three, and five years ago, three stopped work between six and ten years ago, and four have not worked in their profession for more than ten years. Over 27 percent of vocational part-time faculty have worked over twenty years in the profession in which they teach, 31 percent have worked between fifteen and twenty years, twenty-two percent have worked ten years, and ten percent have worked five years. Less than ten percent of the vocational part-time faculty have worked fewer than five years in their profession.

More than 63 percent of the part-time faculty do not teach part-time at another college, but 21 percent currently teach part-time at other two-year colleges. Over 12 percent teach full-time in high schools, and less than five percent teach full-time in another two-year or four-year college. The mean number of hours taught at other schools or colleges is 6.88 hours, with a mean of 1.16 classes. Over 18 percent of the part-time faculty who teach in other schools or colleges teach over 100 students there.

Involvement Profiles: Chi square, Multiple Regression, and Discriminant Analysis for faculty who were not new. (Detailed results in Appendix C.)

Division Type. Of the twelve involvement variables, six showed a significant chi square relationship (significance less than .001) between the type of division and involvement (see Table 1). The "Career" faculty tended to talk most frequently with the division deans, department chairs, and other faculty in the division. Those in the Business division talked the least with the department chair and with other faculty, and "Vocational/Technical" faculty talked the least with their division dean. "Career" faculty and "Vocational/Technical" faculty attended division meetings more than those in other divisions, and "Business" faculty attended division meetings less than others. Chi square analysis (significance less than .05) indicated that "Business faculty" and "Career

faculty" were more involved in their divisions than those in other divisions. Finally, "Liberal Arts" faculty showed a desire for more involvement in their division, and "Vocational/Technical" faculty tended not to want more involvement in the division (significance less than .05).

The Discriminant Analysis of involvement variables by division type correctly classified over half of the cases (see Table 28). The involvement variables best predicted the Business faculty (75.5 percent correctly predicted), then the Vocational and Technical Education faculty (51.5 percent correctly predicted), Liberal Arts faculty (47.2 percent correctly predicted), and Career faculty (46.9 percent correctly predicted). The Math and Science faculty were not predicted well by this model (11.1 percent correctly predicted). This model indicated similar results to those in the chi square analysis. Business faculty scored highly on "Function 1," which means that they tended to talk to other faculty less frequently and attended division meetings less than those in other divisions. Career faculty scored highly on "Function 2," indicating that they were more likely to talk to their division dean or department chair, and they were likely to desire greater involvement in their division. Liberal Arts faculty showed a high negative score on "Function 3," which indicated an interest in meeting more faculty and a desire for more involvement in their division and in the college. Vocational/Technical Education faculty showed a high negative score on "Function 1," but a high positive score on "Function 2." This indicates that they talk frequently to other faculty and they attend meetings, but they talk to the division dean and department chair infrequently, and they do not want more involvement in the division.

Length of teaching. In the chi-square analysis, three of the twelve involvement variables produced significant relationships (less than .05) with years of teaching part-

time at the college (See Table 2). First, those who feel the most involved with the college have been teaching part-time at the college for over ten years. However, unlike those who have been teaching up to one year, they do not want more involvement in the college or in the division. The results of the multiple regression analysis (R square=.09) indicated that those who have been teaching longer have no desire for greater involvement in the division and tend to talk less frequently with the department chair than newer part-time faculty (See Table 29).

"Hopeful Full-timers". Three of the twelve involvement variables showed a significant relationship at the .00001 level in the chi square analysis (see Table 3). The "hopeful full-timers" want to meet more faculty and want to become more involved in the college and in the division. In addition, three involvement variables were significantly related at less than .05: those who hope to teach full-time talk to the department chair frequently, and as new faculty they received good guidance from a full-time faculty member and from the division dean. The multiple regression analysis (R square=.17) showed that the strongest predictor of "hopeful full-timers" is a desire for more involvement in the division, followed by a desire to meet more faculty, talking to the department chair frequently, and receiving memos regularly (see Table 30).

Vocational and Academic Faculty. Three of the twelve involvement variables were significantly associated (significance less than .01) with teaching in a vocational or academic subject area in the chi square analysis (see Table 4). "Vocational faculty" attend division meetings and feel involved in their division, but do not want more involvement in their division. Two additional variables were significant at less than .05: "vocational faculty" receive memos from their division dean, but they do not want to meet more faculty, and do not want more involvement in the college. The reverse is true of academic

faculty: they are less likely to attend meetings, do not receive memos from their division dean, and feel less involved in their division, but they would like to meet faculty, and would like to become more involved in the college and in their division. In the multiple regression analysis (R square=.08), the strongest predictor of vocational faculty was feeling involved in the division, followed by a lack of desire for greater involvement in the division, and attending division meetings (see Table 31).

Males and Females. Only one variable of the twelve showed a significant chi square relationship (signficance=.01): males feel more strongly involved in the college than females (see Table 5). In the multiple regression analysis, none of the variables entered the regression.

Day and Evening Faculty. According to the chi square analyses, "day faculty" talk to the department chair (significance=.0007) and other department faculty (significance=.02) more frequently than "evening faculty". "Day faculty" are also more likely to attend division meetings than "evening faculty" (see Table 6). The multiple regression analysis (R square=.06) revealed similar results: "day faculty" were more likely to talk to the department chair frequently, and were more likely to attend division meetings than "evening faculty" (see Table 32).

"Moonlighters". No significant relationship was found between working full-time in another job and any of the involvement variables in the chi square analysis (see Table 7). However, the multiple regression (R square=.02) showed that "Moonlighters" tend to talk less frequently with other faculty (see Table 33).

"Full-time teachers". In both the chi square analysis (significance=.03) and the multiple regression analysis (R square=.02), one significant relationship was found:

those who teach full-time in another institution do not feel that they received good guidance from their division dean when they were new (see Tables 8 and 34).

"Freeway fliers". The chi square analysis revealed no significant relationships with any of the involvement variables (see Table 9). In the multiple regression analysis, no variables entered the regression.

Professional Profiles: Chi Square, Multiple Regression, and Discriminant Analysis for all part-time faculty

Division type. Chi square analysis revealed significant relationships with all twelve professional profile variables at or below .001 significance level (see Table 11). Business faculty and have been teaching the longest, and Liberal Arts faculty are the newest faculty members. Career faculty tend to teach day classes, and Business faculty tend to teach in the evening. Business faculty teach the fewest number of hours and the fewest classes. Math and science faculty teach the greatest number of hours, and Career faculty teach the greatest number of classes. Liberal arts faculty would like to teach full-time, but Business faculty do not. When asked to categorize themselves as either "vocational" or "academic" faculty, all of the Liberal arts faculty said they were "academic" faculty and all of the Vocational/Technical faculty classified themselves as "vocational." Most of the Business faculty and the Career faculty classified themselves as "vocational" faculty. Liberal arts faculty overwhelmingly do not work full-time, but the vast majority of Business faculty do. The Math and science faculty tend to teach full-time in other schools or colleges, but those in the Business division are the least likely to teach full-time or part-time in another institution. The Liberal arts faculty are most likely to teach part-time in other colleges. The Business faculty tend to be the oldest, and the Career faculty are the youngest. Males tend to dominate the Business faculty, while the

Liberal arts faculty are primarily female. The highest degree attainment may be found among the Liberal arts faculty, who are most likely to have earned a Ph.D. The Vocational/Technical faculty tend to have earned a bachelor's degree or less.

The results of the Discriminant Analysis of the Professional Profile variables by Division type (see Table 35) were consistent with the chi square analysis. Over 61 percent of the cases were correctly classified, indicating high predictive value. The model correctly predicted 84.9 percent of the Liberal Arts faculty, 64.1 percent of the Vocational/Technical faculty, 63.6 percent of the Business faculty, 52.8 percent of the Math and Science faculty, and 31 percent of the Career Faculty. Liberal Arts faculty scored highly on Discriminant Function 1, but Vocational/Technical faculty had a high negative score on Discriminant Function 1. This indicated that the Liberal Arts faculty were likely to classify themselves as "academic" faculty, and the Vocational/Technical faculty classified themselves primarily as "vocational faculty. In addition, the Liberal Arts faculty were likely to have earned higher degrees, and the Vocational/Technical faculty lower degrees than other part-time faculty. Business faculty had a high score on Discriminant Function 2, but Career faculty had a high negative score on Discriminant Function 2. This indicated that the Business faculty tended to teach evening classes, while the Career faculty tended to teach during the day; the Business faculty taught fewer hours and the Career faculty taught more hours than other part-time faculty; and the Business faculty were likely to work full-time in the profession, while the career faculty were not. Math and Science faculty scored highly on Discriminant Function 3, which indicated that they were likely to teach more hours, and also likely to teach full-time in another institution.

Length of teaching. Eight of the twelve variables showed a significant relationship below .05 in the chi square analysis (see Table 12). Those who have been teaching over 10 years are likely to teach in the evening, teach three hours or less per week, do not hope to teach full-time, are currently teaching full-time, are likely to be age 50 or older, and are likely to be male. Faculty who have completed 6 to 10 years of teaching are likely to be working full-time in their profession and are unlikely to be teaching part-time in other institutions. Those who have been teaching between 2 and 5 years are the most likely to be teaching part-time at another institution, and teach the greatest number of hours: over seven hours per week. Finally, the newest faculty who have been teaching up to one year are very likely to be teaching during the day, hope to teach full-time, do not work full-time or teach full-time, are likely to be under forty years of age, and are likely to be female. The multiple regression (R square=.30) revealed similar results (see Table 36). The strongest predictor of longevity as a part-time faculty member was teaching in the evening, followed by age, gender, teaching more classes, working full-time, and teaching full-time.

"Hopeful full-timers". In the chi square analysis, the professional profile of the "Hopeful Full-timer" indicated significant relationships with ten of the professional profile variables, seven of which were at or below .001 significance (see Table 13). "Hopeful full-timers" tend to be newer faculty who have been teaching one year or less, teach day classes, teach over seven hours per week, teach in academic subjects, do not work full-time in their field, teach part-time in other institutions, are under forty, are female, and have a master's degree. In the multiple regression analysis (R square=.21), the strongest predictor of "Hopeful full-timers" was not working full-time, followed by teaching part-time in another institution, having earned a master's degree or doctorate,

teaching a greater number of hours at the college, and being a new part-time faculty member (see Table 37).

Vocational and Academic Faculty. In the chi square analysis of Vocational and Academic faculty (see Table 14), three of the professional profile variables were significant at less than .0001: "Vocational faculty" tend to teach in technical education, business education, and career education and they tend to have a bachelor's degree or less; "Academic faculty" tend to have a master's degree or doctorate, they tend to teach part-time at other colleges and would like a full-time teaching position. In addition, the following relationships were significant at less than .05: "Vocational faculty" are more likely to work full-time in their profession, they teach in the evening, they teach a greater number of clases than "Academic faculty," and they are likely to be male (signficance=.02). In the multiple regression analysis (R square=.27) the strongest predictor of "Vocational faculty" was a lower academic degree, followed by not teaching part-time or full-time in other institutions (see Table 38).

Males and Females. Four of the professional profile variables were significantly related to gender at or less than .001 (see Table 15): males tend to work full-time in their profession, do not want to teach full-time, teach evening classes, and are more likely to hold either a bachelor's degree or a doctorate; females are more likely to have earned a master's degree, would like a full-time teaching position, teach day classes, and are unlikely to work full-time. In addition, three variables were significant at less than .05: males are likely to have been teaching part-time over 10 years while females are likely to have taught for one year or less; females are more likely than males to teach part-time in other institutions; and females are more likely to teach in academic disciplines, while males tend to teach in vocational fields. In the multiple regression

analysis of male and female part-timers (R square=.12), the three variables which showed the strongest relationship to female part-time faculty were not working full-time, having taught part-time for fewer years, and hoping to teach full-time (see Table 39).

Day and Evening Faculty. Four of the twelve professional profile variables were significant at or below the .0001 level (see Table 16). "Evening faculty" tend to have been teaching part-time over 10 years, teach up to three hours per week, are likely to be working full-time, and are unlikely to desire a full-time teaching position. "Day faculty" are likely to have been teaching part-time for up to one year, teach over seven hours per week, are unlikely to be working full-time, and would like a full-time teaching position. The following four variables showed a significant relationshp at or below .005: "Evening faculty" tend to be male, teach one class, are likely to teach full-time and unlikely to teach part-time at other institutions. "Day faculty" are likely to be female, teach three or more classes, are unlikely to teach full-time, but probably teach part-time at other institutions. Finally, two variables were significant at .01: "Day faculty" tend to teach academic subjects, "Evening faculty" tend to teach vocational subjects, and "Day faculty" tend to be younger than "Evening faculty". In the multiple regression analysis (R square= .19) only three variables showed strong predictive value: "Evening faculty" are likely to have been teaching part-time longer, teach fewer hours, and work full-time in their field (see Table 40).

"Moonlighters". According to the chi square analysis, the following six variables were significant at less than .0001 (see Table 17): "Moonlighters", those who work full-time in their profession, do not want a full-time teaching position, do not teach part-time in other institutions, have earned a bachelor's degree, are male, teach evening courses, and

teach up to three hours per week. Also, "Moonlighters" are likely to have been teaching part-time from 6 to 10 years (significance=.0003), are likely to teach in vocational fields (significance=.008), and are likely to teach full-time (significance=.02). "Moonlighters" were predicted with five variables in the multiple regression analysis (R square=.21): they do not hope to teach full-time; they do not teach part-time at another institution; they are male; they teach fewer hours; and they have been teaching part-time longer than those who do not work full-time (see Table 41).

"Full-time teachers." Five of the twelve variables were significantly related (less than .05 significance) to teaching full-time at other institutions (see Table 18). "Full-time teachers" are likely to have taught part-time for over 10 years, tend to teach in the evening, do not teach part-time in other institutions, have earned a master's degree, and, oddly, are more likely to also work full-time in their profession than those who are not full-time teachers. In the multiple regression analysis (R square=.09), the three predictors of "Full-time teachers" were not teaching part-time in another institution, teaching part-time longer, and teaching in an academic field (see Table 42).

"Freeway fliers." In the chi-square analysis, eight variables were significantly related (at or below .001) to teaching part-time at other institutions (see Table 19). "Freeway fliers" are likely to have been teaching part-time between two and five years; they teach day classes; they would like a full-time teaching position; they tend to teach in academic subjects; they are more likely to be female than male; they are unlikely to work full-time in their profession; they are unlikely to teach full-time in another institution; and they are likely to have earned a Master's degree. The multiple regression analysis (R square=.18) showed that the strongest predictors of "Freeway fliers" were, in order, not

working full-time in the profession, hoping to teach full-time, not teaching full-time in another institution, and teaching in an academic subject area (see Table 43).

Involvement Analysis for faculty who were not new: Chi square and Multiple Regression.

Several of the involvement variables were analyzed to determine if there were any significant relationships. The following four relationships were significant at less than .00001: those who feel involved in the college also feel involved in their division (Table 21); those who want more involvement in the college also want more involvement in their division (Table 22); those who want more involvement in the college would also like to meet more faculty (Table 25); and those who want more involvement in their division would also like to meet more faculty (Table 26). No significant relationships were found between current involvement in the college and desire for more involvement in the college (Table 23), and current involvement in the division and desire for more involvement in the division (Table 24).

In the multiple regression analysis (R square=.11) involvement with the college was predicted with three variables: guidance from division dean, attending meetings, and talking to division dean (Table 44). Involvement with the division (R square=.13) was predicted with attending division meetings, receiving guidance from the division dean, and talking to the division dean (Table 45). The desire to become more involved in the college (R square=.21) was predicted with two variables: a desire to meet more faculty, and receiving guidance from a full-time faculty member (Table 46). Finally, the desire to become more involved in the division (R square=.14) was predicted with a desire to meet more faculty (Table 47).

Chi square analysis: Involvement variables with guidance from division dean.

Does receiving guidance from the division dean as a new faculty member affect the amount of involvement later? Chi square analysis was used to compare receiving guidance from the division dean with the twelve involvement variables for faculty who were not new. Four of the twelve involvement variables showed a significant relationship (less than .05): those who received guidance from the division dean also received guidance from a full-time faculty member, they feel more involved in the college, feel more involved in the division, and talk to the division dean more frequently (see Table 27).

Multiple Regression and T-Tests: Number of Teaching Hours

In the first regression (Table 48) the number of teaching hours was predicted with the following involvement variables (R square=.14): those who teach more hours at the college tend to talk to other faculty more frequently, want more involvement in the division, and attend division meetings. In the second regression (Table 49), the number of teaching hours was predicted with the following professional profile variables (R square=.39): those who teach more hours also teach more classes; they do not work full-time in their profession; they teach during the day, and they hope to teach full-time.

The t-tests for number of teaching hours revealed the following significant results with two-tail probability of less than .05 using a pooled variance estimate:

- "Hopeful Full-timers" teach more hours than those who do not hope to teach full-time. [t= -4.04] (Table 50)
- Female faculty teach more hours than male faculty. [t= -2.44] (Table 52)
- Day faculty teach more hours than evening faculty. [t=4.69] (Table 53)
- "Moonlighters" teach fewer hours than those who do not work full-time. [t=4.77] (Table 54)

- "New faculty" (those who have been teaching from 0 to five years) teach more hours than "Old faculty" (those who have been teaching over 5 years). [t=2.20] (Table 56)
- Those who talk to other division faculty more frequently (at least once per week) also tend to teach more hours than those who talk to other faculty less frequently (once per month or twice per semester). [t=4.83] (Table 63)
- Those who attend division meetings also tend to teach more hours than those who do not attend division meetings. [t=3.24] (Table 64)

No significant relationship was found between the mean number of teaching hours and vocational and academic faculty (Table 51) or "Full-time Teachers" (Table 55) or "Freeway Fliers" (Table 57)

In four t-tests for the four involvement variables, only one showed significance for teaching hours:

- Faculty who want more involvement in their division teach more hours than those who do not want more involvement. [t=2.14] (Table 56).

No significant relationship was found between teaching hours and the following involvement variables: current involvement in college or division (Tables 58 and 59), desire for more involvement in the college (Table 60), and talking to the division dean (Table 62).

Discussion

This study was designed to answer the following three questions: 1) Are the part-time faculty well-qualified?; 2) What are the frustrations of the part-time faculty?; and 3) Are part-time faculty interested in greater involvement? However, before analyzing the results to arrive at answers to these three questions, it is important to first gain a clearer understanding of the part-time faculty through an examination of their demographic and professional characteristics.

Characteristics of Part-time Faculty.

Demographic attributes. The results indicate some interesting similarities between the full-time and part-time faculty at Fullerton College. About 60 percent of the part-time faculty are male and 40 percent are female. Of the full-time faculty, 63 percent are male and 37 percent are female [Kelly, 1987]. Similar results were found in a study of part-time faculty in all California community colleges: 56 percent were male, and 44 percent were female [California Community Colleges, 1988, p. 40]

Although the gender ratio is quite similar, the part-time faculty tend to be somewhat younger than the full-time faculty. In 1986 the median age of the full-time faculty at Fullerton College was 51 years, and the median age of the part-time faculty was 42 years [Kelly, 1987]. In 1987, the mean age of part-time faculty in California community colleges was 43 [California Community Colleges, 1988, p. 38]. The modal age of the part-time faculty in 1988 was between 40 and 49 years, which represents 39 percent of the part-timers. In 1986, the modal age of the full-time faculty in 1986 was between 50 and 59 years, representing 40 percent of the faculty. It is likely that the part-time faculty who are now in their forties obtained their degrees and started their college teaching careers in the 1970's when there were very few tenure-track positions

available. However, well-qualified part-time faculty who want to teach full-time may be in a good position to move into a tenure-track teaching job when the full-time faculty start to retire in large numbers over the next several years.

Length of teaching at Fullerton College. The results indicate that there is a tremendous turnover of part-time faculty at Fullerton College. Over 36 percent of the part-time faculty had been at Fullerton for one year or less. If one third of the part-time faculty were new every year, processing and orienting new faculty would represent a huge administrative chore. Moreover, high turnover of part-time faculty also represents a tremendous managerial load for division deans and department chairs who must locate, interview, hire, orient, and manage a large number of new part-time faculty each year.

Because this study is not longitudinal, it is not possible to determine if there was an unusually high number of new part-time faculty in 1988. In fact, it is quite possible that a high turnover rate is normal among part-time faculty, particularly among the 37 percent who work at several different institutions. Most "freeway fliers" have been teaching at Fullerton College between two and five years [Appendix C, Table 19]. They are likely to try to teach at those colleges which have higher pay rates and at colleges which offer them more teaching hours or better working conditions.

In addition, those who have been teaching at Fullerton College up to one year are more likely to teach during the day, hope to teach full-time, are likely to be under 40 years of age, and are more likely to be female [Appendix C, Table 12]. These part-time faculty are very valuable to colleges: they are young and committed to college teaching. Those who are well-qualified could provide a pool of faculty to replace retiring faculty over the next several years. Moreover, most colleges are actively seeking female applicants for full-time tenure-track positions, and this group of newer, younger part-time faculty includes

a substantial percentage of females. If colleges want to cultivate a pool of potential full-time faculty, and if colleges wish to keep a good quality pool of part-time faculty with lower turnover rates from one year to the next, they will have to weigh the costs of raising salaries and improving the working conditions against the managerial and administrative costs of a high turnover in part-time faculty each year.

It is interesting that those who have been teaching at Fullerton College longer are likely to be working full-time in another job or teaching full-time, and are unlikely to be teaching part-time in another institution. Those who teach full-time in another institution, about 18 percent of the part-time faculty, have typically been teaching at Fullerton for over 10 years [Appendix C, Table 18]. Fifty percent of the part-time faculty are "Moonlighters" who work full-time in a business setting and have been teaching at Fullerton College between six and ten years [Appendix C, Table 17]. These part-timers form the stable core of part-time faculty who enjoy teaching part-time and have no desire to exchange their current full-time job for a full-time college teaching position. Unlike the "freeway fliers," because they have a full-time job elsewhere they are probably less dependent financially on the part-time teaching job. For this reason, they may be less likely to seek out the college with the best pay and working conditions and more likely to continue teaching at one college because of convenience and familiarity. If colleges realized this, they might be tempted to take advantage of the situation by continuing to pay these part-time faculty poorly. However, this would not be wise in the long term, because poor pay and working conditions would ultimately affect the quality of all part-time faculty, particularly those who teach at several different colleges.

Vocational and Academic faculty. It was somewhat surprising to learn that only 40 percent of the part-time faculty in this study teach vocational subjects. One of the

advantages of part-time faculty which is often mentioned in the literature is the fact that many of them are current in their field: they work full-time in business, then come in to share their expertise with students who want to enter that field. But the results of this study indicate that 60 percent of the faculty do not teach in vocational fields. The majority of part-time faculty fit the stereotype of the "academic gypsy:" those who teach academic subjects in more than one institution.

Although the advantages of using part-time faculty in vocational fields are clear, it seems that there is no clear advantage to using part-time faculty in academic fields. In fact, a good argument could be made for converting several part-time positions into one full-time position whenever possible to prevent the "academic gypsy" syndrome among part-time faculty in academic fields. Such a conversion would resolve frustrations for both department chairs and academic part-time faculty. Department chairs would rather manage one full-time faculty member rather than many different part-time faculty members. Academic part-timers would rather teach full-time in one institution rather than teaching part-time in several institutions to make up the equivalent of a full-time teaching load.

In California, Assembly Bill 1725, which went into effect in 1988, provides community colleges with funding to convert part-time positions into full-time positions. In addition, A.B. 1725 also requires community colleges to work toward a ratio of 75 percent of class hours taught by full-time faculty and 25 percent of class hours by part-time faculty. In 1986 Fullerton College full-time faculty taught about 60 percent of the class hours, and part-time faculty taught about 40 percent [Kelly, 1987]. In many community colleges the number of part-time teaching hours is much greater than the number of class hours taught by full-time faculty. Converting part-time positions in

academic fields would produce two major benefits: division deans would have fewer faculty to manage; and academic part-time faculty who currently teach at several different colleges to make up the equivalent of a full-time teaching load would be able to devote their time and energy to one institution.

Qualifications of Part-Time Faculty.

Academic Qualifications. Overall, the full-time faculty of Fullerton College have better academic qualifications than the part-time faculty. In 1986 over 75 percent of the full-time faculty held a master's degree and about 12 percent had earned doctorates. Interestingly, a higher percentage of the part-time faculty, over 16 percent, have doctorates. But significantly fewer hold a master's degree: only half of all part-time faculty. Only about eight percent of full-time faculty have a bachelor's degree as the highest degree earned, but over 21 percent of the part-time faculty have a bachelor's degree. Over eleven percent of part-time faculty have not earned a bachelor's degree, but only two percent of the full-time faculty have less than a bachelor's degree [Kelly, 1987]. However, when considering the degrees of only academic part-time faculty, the academic qualifications are significantly higher. Over 22 percent of the part-time faculty have earned a doctorate, over 65 percent have a master's degree, and only 12 percent have a bachelor's degree.

Vocational Qualifications. Although their degree attainment tends to be lower than academic faculty, vocational part-time faculty are very well qualified in their profession. Over 85 percent are currently working in their field, and most are working full-time. About 90 percent of the vocational faculty have worked full-time in their profession at some point in their career. Most vocational faculty bring many years of experience to the classroom: over 27 percent have worked over 20 years in their profession; 31 percent

have worked between 15 and 20 years; and 22 percent have worked ten years. Students in classes taught by vocational part-time faculty are very fortunate: they are likely to be obtaining current information about the field, and they have a unique opportunity to tap into the expertise of a seasoned professional.

Teaching Skills. The teaching skills of part-time faculty appear to be somewhat limited, indicating a potential need for faculty development workshops on college teaching. Most part-time faculty rely heavily on lecture and discussion and tend not to use other teaching methods. In the community college it is particularly important for faculty to develop a wide variety of teaching skills to address the wide range of abilities and variety of preferred learning styles of a very diverse student population.

The results of the survey also indicate that evaluation of student learning may be problematic for part-time faculty. The Fullerton College Catalog states, "Grades are based upon the quality of work done; that is, upon actual accomplishment in courses offered for credit" (1989, p. 29). Although attendance should not be used as one of the evaluation criteria for a course grade, over 70 percent of part-time faculty stated that they use attendance in grading students. Part-time faculty also use a somewhat limited number of different methods to evaluate student learning. Most use a comprehensive final exam, class participation, and multiple choice tests. As with teaching methods, it is critically important for part-time faculty in the community college to use a wide variety of methods of evaluation to recognize the many different learning styles in the typical community college classroom.

On the positive side, almost all part-time faculty give their students a course outline or syllabus at the beginning of the semester which includes a class schedule and grading criteria. This seems to indicate that part-time faculty want to give their students some

clear expectations for the course, and that they come to the class well-prepared for the beginning of the semester.

Frustrations of Part-time Faculty.

The frustrations of part-time faculty expressed in this study are consistent with the literature. Generally, part-time faculty feel that they are being treated as second class citizens: part-time faculty with the same qualifications as full-time faculty are paid less for teaching the same classes, they have no benefits, and they have no guarantee of employment from one semester to the next. Resolving these frustrations would be extremely costly for many colleges, but if colleges are interested in maintaining a high-quality pool of part-time faculty, these issues must be addressed.

Colleges tend to rationalize the lower pay by also noting that part-time faculty are not expected to hold office hours or provide institutional service through committee work. However, in reality, many part-time faculty have stated that they need an office in which to meet with their students before class. This seems to indicate that at least some part-time faculty do hold "office hours," even though they are not required to do so. Moreover, many part-time faculty have stated that they would like to be more involved in their division and in the campus. Perhaps one solution might be a different status and additional pay for those who want to be more involved: an "associate faculty" status. It seems that part-time faculty who do all of the same work as full-time faculty, but are not tenured, could receive pro-rata pay and benefits, depending on the percentage of a full-time load being taught. Again, this would involve a substantial financial commitment on the part of the college, but the potential results would be positive. The college would benefit through the added involvement of the part-time faculty, the students would benefit through office

hours, and the part-time faculty would benefit by becoming more involved in the campus and in the division, and by being paid fairly for their additional work.

Many faculty noted that they would like to teach more classes, and slightly over half stated that they would like a full-time position. Some colleges have a strict policy against using part-time faculty for more than 50 or 60 percent of a full-time teaching load, because if the faculty member teaches over this percentage for several consecutive semesters they may become eligible for tenure, even if there is no tenure-track position. It may be a good idea to revise such policies in order to allow part-time faculty to teach as many classes as they desire, or as many as the division dean wishes to have them teach. Ideally, this should be accompanied by an equitable pay structure. The result of such policies is likely to be a reduction in the number of part-time faculty who teach part-time in several different institutions, and an increase in the involvement of the part-time faculty at one institution. In addition, as mentioned earlier, colleges should consider the possibility of converting several part-time positions into one full-time position, particularly in academic disciplines. These changes in policies for part-time faculty would be costly to implement, but the long term gains in the commitment of part-time faculty to one institution and the involvement of part-time faculty would ultimately be beneficial to the institution.

One of the frustrations often mentioned by part-time faculty is the uncertainty of having a teaching job from one semester to the next. Unless some form of pro-rata tenure were awarded, this frustrating situation will continue to exist. One solution would be for division deans to give part-time faculty the courtesy of very early notice about the classes they will be teaching the following semester. One part-time instructor noted, "As a

minimum it would help to be consulted or at least advised when the night or time of the class I've taught for years is changed!"

As noted earlier in this study, at the start of the Fall 1988 semester, the total population of part-time faculty was 432. But after the first two weeks of the semester, due to cancelled classes and shifting of some evening classes to full-time faculty, the number of part-time faculty fell to 371! In addition to early notification, if division deans scheduled fewer sections of classes, those classes would be more likely to fill, and fewer classes would have to be cancelled due to low enrollment. The positive result would be that part-time faculty would be less likely to lose a class after the start of the semester.

Several other frustrations of part-time faculty may also be resolved at little or no cost to the institution. For those who want office space, arrangements could be made for evening part-time faculty to share an office with full-time faculty members who only use their offices during the day. Even if this were not possible, the division or department office could set aside some workspace and filing cabinet storage space for part-time faculty. This would give part-time faculty a base of operation, and would alleviate the need for part-time faculty to carry course materials, books, and supplies to the college for each class meeting.

Some part-time faculty simply want to be treated with more respect and recognized as individuals who contribute their expertise to the department and to the college. One part-timer wrote: "Notice we're here. Part-timers are not a 'real part of the school.' Look in the directory." Another commented, "Make part-time instructors feel like we belong and are not just a convenience for them to fill a vacant spot no one else wants." Several had comments about wanting to be treated as a part of the team. One wrote, "Listen to what I

have to say. Nobody asks. I feel uneasy when I have a comment or suggestion. I don't think anybody wants it." Treating part-time faculty with respect, including them, and validating their contributions as faculty members costs nothing, yet it is critically important to the satisfaction of part-time faculty.

Involvement of Part-time Faculty.

Desire for more involvement. Only one fifth of the part-time faculty feel involved in their division, and even fewer feel involved in the college. However, over 60 percent want more involvement. This would seem to indicate that the college and the divisions are not providing adequate opportunities for the involvement of part-time faculty. It is interesting to note that feelings of involvement appear to be unrelated to the number of hours taught. In other words, those who taught more hours did not feel more involved than those who taught fewer hours [Appendix C, Tables 58 and 59]. But the desire for more involvement in the division is significantly related to the number of hours taught: those who teach more hours want more involvement in their division [Appendix C, Table 61]. This result provides a good argument for increasing the number of teaching hours of part-time faculty, as mentioned earlier.

In addition, the part-time faculty who feel most involved have been teaching longer, but newer faculty desire more involvement. Those who teach in vocational fields feel involved, and those who teach academic subjects want more involvement. Daytime part-timers and those who attend division meetings feel more involved. Those who hope to teach full-time and those who want to meet more faculty desire more involvement. And interestingly, males feel involved, but females desire more involvement. Many of these results can be attributed to the basic differences between vocational and academic faculty. Part-time faculty in vocational fields attend meetings, and are likely to be male.

Academic faculty are more likely to be female, they hope to teach full-time, and they want to meet more faculty. Although daytime faculty are more likely to teach in academic subjects, they are also more likely to attend division meetings. However, daytime faculty represent only about one quarter of all part-time faculty in this study.

Communication with Division Deans and Department Chairs. Over half of the part-time faculty talk to their department chair at least once per month, and 42 percent talk to their division dean at least once each month. But this means that about half of the faculty talk to their department chair or division dean very infrequently. It is likely that those who teach only in the evening, nearly three-quarters of the part-time faculty, are unlikely to see their department chair or division dean. In the multiple regression analysis of involvement, talking frequently to the division dean was one of the three strongest predictors of involvement in the division [Appendix C, Table 45]. For this reason, division deans and department chairs may be wise to make an extra effort to stay in touch with the part-time faculty members by telephone or by staying late one night each week, rotating the evening in order to see all part-time faculty over several weeks. In addition, part-time faculty should also be encouraged to make a strong effort to communicate with the division dean through regular phone calls or by simply stopping at the college occasionally during the day.

Part-time faculty who received good guidance from their division dean when they were new were likely to talk more frequently to the division chair, and felt more involved in the division and in the college [Appendix C, Table 27]. This seems to indicate that it is critically important for the division dean to invest some time in orienting the new part-time faculty members when they are new, because the benefits of involvement and increased communication are likely to result in the future.

Communication with other faculty. Only half of the part-time faculty talk to other faculty in their division once each week. But half of the part-timers would also like to meet more faculty. In the multiple regression analysis, a high correlation was found between a desire for more involvement in the division and a desire to meet more faculty [Appendix C, Table 47]. Many part-time faculty members simply want to be included in department activities. One wrote, "This year was the first time I was invited to the luncheon at the beginning of the semester. That was nice!"

The college could provide more opportunities for part-time faculty to meet other faculty by simply inviting them to all campus faculty events. But for those who teach only in the evening, the college may also want to provide special part-time faculty events, social gatherings, or faculty development workshops on several different evenings so all part-time faculty would have an opportunity to attend events and meet more faculty.

Division deans may also facilitate greater communication among part-time faculty or between full-time and part-time faculty by scheduling several formal or informal meetings each semester on different evenings and inviting both full-time and part-time faculty. This would provide opportunities for part-time faculty to meet others in the division who teach the same classes, and would be particularly effective in encouraging more contacts between part-time and full-time faculty.

Division deans may also consider setting up mentoring relationships between full-time and part-time faculty. Each part-time faculty member could be teamed up with a full-time faculty "mentor," who would be available by telephone or on campus to answer questions and assist the part-time faculty member. In some departments, some informal mentoring has already been in effect. The results of the survey indicate that slightly over half of the part-time faculty felt that they received good guidance from a full-time faculty

member when they were new. In a chi square analysis, a significant relationship was shown between receiving guidance from the division dean and receiving guidance from a full-time faculty member [Appendix C, Table 27]. In addition, those who received good guidance from a full-time faculty member were likely to want more involvement in the college [Appendix C, Table 46]. These results indicate the importance of providing some form of guidance or mentoring for new part-time faculty.

Although setting up evening meetings and mentor relationships may entail extra work for the division dean, the contacts that are made between full-time and part-time faculty would be likely to have three long-term positive results: first, division deans would probably not need to spend as much time taking care of the details of managing part-time faculty because fewer problems would be likely to arise if part-time faculty were assisted by full-time faculty; second, part-time faculty would feel more comfortable knowing that they could call their "mentor" when they have questions about college procedures; and third, full-time faculty members would be likely to benefit through exchanges with part-timers by gaining fresh ideas and insights.

Department Meetings. Generally, it appears that division deans do a good job of communicating with part-time faculty through the mail, but they could make a greater effort to involve part-time faculty in department or division meetings. Most part-time faculty stated that they did not attend division meetings because they were held at times when they were unavailable to attend. Moreover, many part-time faculty assume, perhaps incorrectly, that the meetings are intended for full-time faculty only. But quite a few part-time faculty commented that they would like to be invited to department meetings with full-time faculty and with other part-time faculty, and several mentioned that it would be a good idea to have evening meetings for part-time faculty. It is

important to note that the multiple regression analysis showed that the strongest predictor of involvement in the department was attending deparment meetings [Appendix C, Table 45].

Several part-time faculty remarked that they would like to have an opportunity to give input into curriculum matters and departmental decisions. Comments in the survey included the following suggestions: "Allow us to give more course input;" "Listen to our input regarding subject matter;" "Involve part-time instructors in department decisions." It is important for division deans and full-time faculty to recognize the importance of input from part-time faculty. In vocational fields it is likely that part-time faculty are more current, and could offer valuable advise regarding curriculum matters. In academic fields, part-time faculty who teach at several different colleges may have an abundance of fresh ideas from the other colleges. In both academic and vocational fields it is likely to be beneficial to include part-time faculty in departmental decisions, and particularly in curriculum planning, because they are likely to offer a fresh perspective and more new ideas than full-time faculty who may not want to change because they "have always done it this way." Departments would be wise to take advantage of the expertise and new ideas offered by part-time faculty.

Faculty Development. Instructional topics are of greatest interest to part-time faculty, especially those involving motivational techniques for the classroom, teaching underprepared students, teaching adult learners, and increasing student retention. This seems to indicate a desire for instructional improvement, and an interest in incorporating new instructional techniques. Part-time faculty who work full-time in business are unlikely to have previous teaching experience, and may become frustrated at their own lack of teaching experience. Some may even feel embarassed to go to their division dean

for help, because they may think that if they were hired to teach, they should already know how to teach. For this reason, colleges should consider offering a series of faculty development workshops especially for part-time faculty. For part-time faculty who have no teaching experience, workshops on course preperation and basic college teaching techniques should be provided before the start of the semester. In addition, workshops should be provided for all part-time faculty to assist them in developing a wider variety of teaching and evaluation methods. Faculty development workshops which are offered on a campus-wide basis provide a non-threatening atmosphere for part-time faculty to develop their teaching skills without feeling that their division dean is watching or evaluating them. In addition, campus-wide faculty development workshops that are open to faculty from all disciplines provide the opportunity for part-time faculty to meet other part-timers. This can result in a lively exchange of ideas and the sharing of effective teaching techniques which may be common in one discipline but new to others.

Many part-time faculty also indicated an interest in learning more about the policies and procedures of Fullerton College. In particular, part-time faculty stated that when they were new it would have been helpful to know more about the characteristics of the student population, how to find various offices and people on campus, policies which must be followed, and other basic information about the college such as procedures for ordering audio-visual equipment, availability of various student services, and availability of clerical services for typing and duplicating course materials. Much of this information could easily be compiled into a handbook for part-time faculty which could be distributed to all part-time faculty. Over 82 percent of the part-time faculty felt that such a handbook would be helpful.

Faculty development for part-time faculty should be planned on two levels: institutional faculty development and departmental faculty development. Several part-time instructors pointed out the need for a thorough orientation to their department, including information about how the class they will be teaching fits into the overall departmental curriculum. Some interest was also expressed for discipline-related workshops specifically in the departments. In addition to improving instructional effectiveness in a specific discipline, faculty development within the department would have the added benefit of facilitating good working relationships among full-time and part-time faculty in the discipline.

Conclusion:

How Colleges Can Apply a Human Resources Development Approach to Part-Time Faculty

The results of this study indicate clearly that part-time faculty are well-qualified individuals who should be treated as valuable human resources. The majority of faculty who teach in academic fields have earned graduate degrees. Most vocational faculty are currently working in their profession and have many years of professional experience.

How can colleges take a proactive human resources development approach to part-time faculty? First, some of the frustrations of part-time faculty should be eliminated.

- In academic disciplines, create new full-time positions by consolidating many part-time positions into a few full-time positions.
- Establish an "associate faculty" status for part-time faculty who want to hold regular office hours, participate in department planning activities, and participate in institutional service.
- Provide equal pay and benefits for equal workloads and equal qualifications on a pro rata basis, depending on the percentage of a full teaching load which is taught.
- Create policies that would allow part-time faculty to be hired to teach up to a full teaching load with the clear understanding that teaching many classes over a period of time will not result in "automatic" tenure.
- Give part-time faculty the courtesy of very early notice about the classes they will be teaching the following semester.
- Schedule fewer classes to reduce the chances of classes being cancelled due to low enrollment.
- Make arrangements for evening part-time faculty to share offices with full-time faculty who teach primarily during the day.

- Give part-time faculty a workspace in the department or division office, and provide filing cabinets for storing class materials.
- Provide clerical support for part-time faculty.
- Include part-time faculty in the college catalog and faculty directory.
- Listen to the suggestions of part-time faculty.
- Make part-time faculty feel that they are a part of the team by including them in college and department activities.
- Treat part-time faculty with respect.

Second, because this study indicates that the majority of part-time faculty are interested in becoming more involved in the college, efforts should be made to increase their involvement.

- Encourage division deans to maintain frequent contact with part-time faculty. Division deans or department chairs could plan to work late one night per week, and rotate the evening to maintain contact with all of the part-time faculty who teach on various nights.
- Encourage part-time faculty to maintain frequent contact with their department chair or division dean through regular phone calls or by simply stopping by the college occasionally.
- Encourage division deans to provide good guidance to all new part-time faculty.
- Invite part-time faculty to division and department activities, and make it clear that these activities are not strictly for full-time faculty.
- Invite part-time faculty to all campus faculty events, and make it clear that these events are for all faculty, both full-time and part-time.
- Provide some campus-wide events in the evening just for part-time faculty.

- Provide a campus-wide newsletter just for part-time faculty.
- Create a departmental "mentoring" program in which full-time faculty are teamed with part-time faculty.
- Encourage part-time faculty to contact full-time faculty when they have questions or problems.
- Schedule some division faculty events and department meetings in the evening for both full-time and part-time faculty.
- Provide some evening department meetings just for part-time faculty.
- Actively encourage input from part-time faculty regarding course content, curriculum development, and departmental planning and decision-making.

Finally, because part-time faculty are particularly interested in faculty development activities which will enhance their teaching skills, an organized program of faculty development should be coordinated to meet the special needs of part-timers. Some faculty development activities may be planned as campus-wide activities for all part-time faculty, and others may be planned as departmental or discipline-related workshops.

Campus-wide Faculty Development Activities

1. Orientation of New Part-time Faculty

- Provide an information packet with basic information about the college which includes the following items: campus map, parking instructions, administrative organizational chart, telephone directory, student services available in the evening, college catalog, and class schedule.
- Inform part-time faculty about the characteristics of the students they will encounter in their classes: underprepared students, adult students, and other diverse student populations.

- Provide information on college policies and procedures, and examples of college paperwork: attendance and grading policies, record-keeping procedures, student discipline policies, how to order audio-visual equipment, and the implications of student assessment testing.

2. Workshops for all part-time faculty.

- Provide workshops on basic college teaching techniques: motivational techniques, learning styles, incorporating new teaching techniques, increasing student retention, how to organize a course, and how to prepare course materials.
- Provide workshops on teaching specific student populations: underprepared students, adult learners, disabled students, and minority students.

Division Faculty Development

1. Orientation for New Part-time Faculty

- Provide a through explanation of the department curriculum sequence and where the class to be taught by the part-time faculty member fits into the sequence.
- Provide material on degree and transfer requirements for that discipline.
- Explain the procedures for clerical support in the division: how to get material typed or word processed and duplicated in time for the class meeting.
- Provide information about office space or a workspace and filing cabinet storage within the department office.

2. Discipline-related workshops for all part-time faculty.

- Provide workshops on new teaching techniques which are specific to the discipline.
- Provide seminars or discussion groups to share new trends and methods in the discipline.

If colleges stop considering part-time faculty as "faculty of convenience" and start thinking of them as valuable human resources who enhance the quality of the college, it will make good common sense to take the steps necessary to resolve the frustrations, increase the involvement, and provide for the professional growth and development of part-time faculty. Although implementing some of these new policies and programs will be costly to the institution, the end result will be a more positive working environment for part-time faculty and an atmosphere which encourages part-time faculty to make valuable contributions which will ultimately benefit the institution.

If colleges stop considering part-time faculty as "faculty of convenience" and start thinking of them as valuable human resources who enhance the quality of the college, it will make good common sense to take the steps necessary to resolve the frustrations, increase the involvement, and provide for the professional growth and development of part-time faculty. Although implementing some of these new policies and programs will be costly to the institution, the end result will be a more positive working environment for part-time faculty and an atmosphere which encourages part-time faculty to make valuable contributions which will ultimately benefit the institution.

References

Abel, E. K. (1984). Terminal degrees: The job crisis in higher education. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Albert, L. S., & Watson, R. J. (1980). Mainstreaming part-time faculty: Issue or imperative? In M.H. Parsons (Ed.), New Directions for Community Colleges no. 30. Using Part-time Faculty Effectively (73-80). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Alfano, K., Brewer, F., Cohen, A., & Koltai, L. (1990). The evaluation of the effect of AB 1725 on statewide faculty and staff development. Sacramento, California: California State Chancellor's Office.

Arden, E. (1989, May 17). How to help adjunct professors, academe's invisible people. The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. A48.

Beman, R. R. (1980). Observations of an adjunct faculty member. In M.H. Parsons (Ed.), New Directions for Community Colleges no. 30. Using Part-time Faculty Effectively (81-84). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Bennett, J. (1990, February 21). Hire the scholars denied jobs in past decades [Letter to the editor]. The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. B4.

Berman, Weiler Associates. (1987). Exploring faculty development in higher education. Report prepared for the California Postsecondary Education Commission. Berkeley, California: Berman, Weiler Associates.

Bidwell, S. (1988, October). An orientation program for part-time faculty. In Grieve, D. (conference director), Adjunct faculty managers workshop. Workshop proceedings, Cuyahoga Community College and Info-Tec, Cleveland, Ohio.

Biles, G. E., & Tuckman, H. P. (1986). Part-time faculty personnel management policies. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Birnberg, J. R. (1989, August 12). Part-time college teachers. [Letter to the editor]. Los Angeles Times, Part II, p. 19.

Bowen, E. (1987, January 12). Academia's new gypsies. Time, p.65.

Bowen, H. R., & Schuster, J. H. (1986). American professors: A national resource imperiled. New York: Oxford University Press.

Boyer, D., & MacKenzie, D. (1987). The evaluation and development of part-time faculty in community colleges. Community College Review, 15 (3), 33-40.

Boyer, E. L. (1987). College, the undergraduate experience in America. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Bramlett, P., & Rodriguez, R. C. (1982-83, December/January). Part-time faculty, full-time concern. Community and Junior College Journal, 53, 40-41.

Brams, P. C. (1983). What makes part-timers tick? Journal of Staff, Program, & Organizational Development, 1 (2), 39-42.

Cain, M. S. (1988). Toward a theory and a model for integrating part-time faculty into a community college. Community College Review, 16 (3), 42-47.

California Community Colleges Board of Governors. (1987, October). A.B. 1725, Agenda item 5 part IV: "Part-time faculty". Meeting of the Board of Govenors of the California Community Colleges, Santa Monica, California. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 287 531.)

California Community Colleges Office of the Chancellor. (1988, July). Report on staffing and salaries Fall 1987. Report of the Office of the Chancellor, California Community Colleges, Sacramento, California. (Report Number 88-6).

California Community Colleges Office of the Chancellor. (1987, January). Study of part-time instruction. Report of the Office of the Chancellor, California Community Colleges, Sacramento, California. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 278 449).

California Postsecondary Education Commission. (1987). Faculty development from a state perspective. Sacramento, California: California Postsecondary Education Commission.

Carson, V. M. (1988). Supervision of part-time faculty: A model for community colleges. Unpublished manuscript. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 297 794.)

Chronicle of Higher Education. (1989). The almanac of higher education, 1989-90. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1989). The American community college, second edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Commission on the Future of Community Colleges. (1988). Building communities. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Davidson, B. S. (1983-84). Community college part-time faculty and student services: A working model. Community College Review, 11, 30-34.

Delehant, J.E. (1989, September 20). Colleges are exploiting their part-time faculty members. The Chronicle of Higher Education, p.B2.

Dossett, G., Prickett, J., Watts, J., Keller, E., O'Connell, C., Mock, S., Simpson, L., Kennel, D., & Landon, E. (1988, February 13). Part-time college instructors [Letter to the editor]. Los Angeles Times, Part II, p.9.

Douglas, J. M. (1988). Collective bargaining for adjunct faculty. Report of the National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions, Baruch College, New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 298 820.)

Eliason, N. C. (1980). Part-time faculty: A national perspective. In M.H. Parsons (Ed.), New Directions for Community Colleges no. 30. Using Part-time Faculty Effectively (1-11). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Elioff, I. H. (1983, October). The challenge of faculty development for part-timers in noncampus community colleges. Paper presented at the Quality in Off-Campus Credit Programs Conference, sponsored by the Kansas State University Division of Continuing Education, Atlanta, Georgia. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 243 502).

Ernst, R. J., & McFarlane, L. A. (1978). Are we shortchanging our students by using part-time faculty? New Directions for Institutional Research, 18, 89-97.

Esbjornson, C. D. (1990, February 21). Hire the scholars denied jobs in past decades [Letter to the editor]. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. B4-B6.

Flynn, E. A., Flynn, J. F., Grimm, N., & Lockhart, T. (1986). The part-time problem: Four voices. Academe, 72, 12-18.

Friedlander, J. (1980). Instructional practices of part-time faculty. In M.H. Parsons (Ed.), New Directions for Community Colleges no. 30. Using Part-time Faculty Effectively (27-35). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Friedman, M. (1989, May 4). Part-time faculty [Letter to the editor]. Los Angeles Times, Part II, p.10.

Gappa, J. M. (1984). Part-time faculty: Higher education at a crossroads. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, no. 3. Washington, D. C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Gappa, J. M. (1987). The stress-producing working conditions of part-time faculty. In P. Seldin (Ed.), New directions for teaching and learning, no. 29. Coping with faculty stress (pp. 33-42). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Ginsburg, S. G. (1988, February). The value of adjuncts: Recognize and increase it. American School and University, pp.20b-20c.

Gordon, L. (1989, August 1). Campuses part with part-timers. Los Angeles Times, Part I, pp. 1, 17.

Greenwood, R. D. (1980). Making "what's-his-face" feel at home: Integrating part-time faculty. In M.H. Parsons (Ed.), New Directions for Community Colleges no. 30. Using Part-time Faculty Effectively (55-60). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Grieve, D. (1988, October). Seven criteria for successful part-time faculty management. In Grieve, D. (conference director), Adjunct faculty managers workshop. Workshop proceedings, Cuyahoga Community College and Info-Tec, Cleveland, Ohio.

Hairston, M. (1985, April 17). We're hiring too many temporary instructors. The Chronicle of Higher Education, p.80.

Hartleb, D., & Vilter, W. (1986). Part-time faculty, full-time problems. In B. W. Dziech (Ed.), New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 53, Controversies and Decisions in Hard Economic Times (pp.15-22). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Heller, S. (1986, July 30). Extensive use of temporary teachers is crippling academe, AAUP charges. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. 23,26.

Heller, S. (1987, January 28). Part-time teachers turn to unions to alter status as 'academic stepchildren.' The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. 1,12.

Illinois Community College Board (1987). Fiscal year 1987 Illinois public community colleges faculty and staff characteristics: Analysis of part-time faculty. Springfield: Illinois Community College Board. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 283 544).

Jonsson, J. L. (1989, May 4). Part-time faculty [Letter to the editor]. Los Angeles Times, Section II, p.10.

Kekke, R. (1983, April). Who's Mr. Staff: Cheap labor or valued resource? Paper presented at the conference of the Central States Speech Association, Lincoln, Nebraska. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 251 134).

Kelly, D. K. (1987). Profile of the Fullerton College faculty: A comparison of the faculty of 1976 and 1986. Unpublished seminar paper, The Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, California.

Kuchera, M. E., & Miller, S. I. (1988). The effects of perceptions of the academic job market on adjunct faculty: An identity-theory analysis. Sociology of Education, 61, 240-254.

Gordon, L. (1989, August 1). Campuses part with part-timers. Los Angeles Times, Part I, pp. 1, 17.

Greenwood, R. D. (1980). Making "what's-his-face" feel at home: Integrating part-time faculty. In M.H. Parsons (Ed.), New Directions for Community Colleges no. 30. Using Part-time Faculty Effectively (55-60). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Grieve, D. (1988, October). Seven criteria for successful part-time faculty management. In Grieve, D. (conference director), Adjunct faculty managers workshop. Workshop proceedings, Cuyahoga Community College and Info-Tec, Cleveland, Ohio.

Hairston, M. (1985, April 17). We're hiring too many temporary instructors. The Chronicle of Higher Education, p.80.

Hartleb, D., & Vilter, W. (1986). Part-time faculty, full-time problems. In B. W. Dziech (Ed.), New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 53, Controversies and Decisions in Hard Economic Times (pp.15-22). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Heller, S. (1986, July 30). Extensive use of temporary teachers is crippling academe, AAUP charges. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. 23,26.

Heller, S. (1987, January 28). Part-time teachers turn to unions to alter status as 'academic stepchildren.' The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. 1,12.

Illinois Community College Board (1987). Fiscal year 1987 Illinois public community colleges faculty and staff characteristics: Analysis of part-time faculty. Springfield: Illinois Community College Board. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 283 544).

Jonsson, J. L. (1989, May 4). Part-time faculty [Letter to the editor]. Los Angeles Times, Section II, p.10.

Kekke, R. (1983, April). Who's Mr. Staff: Cheap labor or valued resource? Paper presented at the conference of the Central States Speech Association, Lincoln, Nebraska. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 251 134).

Kelly, D. K. (1987). Profile of the Fullerton College faculty: A comparison of the faculty of 1976 and 1986. Unpublished seminar paper, The Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, California.

Kuchera, M. E., & Miller, S. I. (1988). The effects of perceptions of the academic job market on adjunct faculty: An identity-theory analysis. Sociology of Education, 61, 240-254.

Leslie, D. W. (1989). Creative staffing: Problems and opportunities. In G. G. Lozier & M.J. Dooris, (Eds.), New Directions for Institutional Research, no.63, Managing faculty resources (pp.33-44). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc. Publishers.

Leslie, D. W., Kellams, S. E., & Gunne, G. M. (1982). Part-time faculty in American higher education. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Lewis, R. M. (1989, April 21). Part-time faculty, students alike are cheated at community colleges. Los Angeles Times, Section II, Op-Ed page.

Maguire, P. (1983-84). Enhancing the effectiveness of adjunct faculty. Community College Review, 11, 27-33.

Maher, T. H., & Ebben, J. (1978). The margin of quality: Selection and evaluation of part-time faculty. In D. W. Leslie (Ed.), New Directions for Institutional Research no.18, Employing Part-time Faculty (73-88). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Maitland, C. (1987, January/February). Tales of a freeway flyer, or why I left college teaching after 10 years. Change, pp.8-9, 54.

Maitland, C. (1989, April 10). The missing academic generation. Community College Week, p. 5.

Mangan, K. S. (1987, March 4). Part-time instructors offered programs to help them become better teachers. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp.13,16.

McGaughey, J.L. (1985). Part-time faculty: Integrity and integration. In D. Puyear (Ed.), New Directions for Community Colleges, 52, Maintaining Institutional Integrity (pp.37-47).

McMillen, L. (1986, May 14). 1 in 2 part-time teachers at 2-year colleges would accept full-time position if offered. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp.25,28.

Mocker, D. W., & Noble, E. (1981). Training part-time instructional staff. In S. M. Grabowski (Ed.), Preparing educators of adults. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Morton, R. D., & Newman, D. L. (1984, April). Part-time teachers of community colleges: Who are they and why do they teach? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 244 661).

Napoli, D. (1988, October). Utilizing the handbook in an adjunct faculty mentoring program. In Grieve, D. (conference director), Adjunct faculty managers workshop. Workshop proceedings, Cuyahoga Community College and Info-Tec, Cleveland, Ohio.

National Education Association (1988). Part-time, temporary & non-tenure track faculty appointments. Report of the Office of Higher Education of the National Education Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 294 477.)

Nolan, J. (1988, October). Institutional challenges in part-time faculty management. In Grieve, D. (conference director), Adjunct faculty managers workshop. Workshop proceedings, Cuyahoga Community College and Info-Tec, Cleveland, Ohio.

Palmer, J. (1986, August). Approaches to staff development for part-time faculty. ERIC Digest. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Los Angeles, California. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 270 180).

Parsons, M. H. (1980). Realizing part-time faculty potential. New Directions for Community Colleges, 30, 47-53.

Pedras, M. J. (1982). The conceptualization and development of a staff development model for community college part-time faculty. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nevada, Las Vegas. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 239 661).

Peterson, T. (1982). Part-time faculty compensation and staff development in three Kansas City area community colleges. Unpublished manuscript. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 225 615).

Pierce, H. B., & Miller, R. T. (1980). Burlington County College: Development program for adjunct faculty. In M.H. Parsons (Ed.), New Directions for Community Colleges no. 30. Using Part-time Faculty Effectively (37-45). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Plante, P. R. (1987). The art of decision making. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Quigley, M. S. (1986, January 22). In defense of the adjunct faculty member. The Chronicle of Higher Education, p.40.

Rabalais, M. J., & Perritt, J. E. (1983). Instructional development for part-time faculty. Community College Review, 11, 20-22.

Scott, B. A. (1983). Crisis management in American higher education. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Simer, S. (1989, August 12). Part-time college teachers. [Letter to the editor] Los Angeles Times, Part II, p. 19.

Smith, M. L. (1986). Part-time faculty in private junior colleges: 1985-86. Unpublished manuscript. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 274 403).

Spinetta, K. (1990, January). Revising part-time faculty policies and practices in the California community colleges. The News (a publication of the California Association of Community Colleges), p. 13.

Sworder, S. (1987). Determination of the effect of an instructor's employment status (full-time or part-time) on the decision of students to enroll. Unpublished manuscript. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 277 408).

Townsend, B. K. (1986, May 28). Outsiders inside academe: The plight of temporary teachers. The Chronicle of Higher Education, p.72.

Tucker, A. (1984). Chairing the academic department. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Tuckman, H. P.(1978, December). Who is part-time in academe? AAUP Bulletin, 65, 305-315.

Turgeon, M. L. (1983). Part time faculty: A comparative profile of characteristics and effectiveness at Corning Community College. Unpublished manuscript. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 244 654).

Vaughan, G. B. (1986). Part-time faculty: Nemesis or savior? In B. W. Dziech (Ed.), New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 53, Controversies and Decisions in Hard Economic Times (pp. 23-30). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Watkins, B. T. (1989, October 4). Colleges urged to use full-time professors in writing programs. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. A13, A15.

Wilkie, A. S., & Griessman, B. E. (1979). The hidden professoriate: A challenge in the emerging tenure crisis. In A.S. Wilkie (Ed.), The hidden professoriate: Credentialism, professionalism, and the tenure crisis (pp. 17-32). Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, Inc.

Williams, J. M. (1985). A study of professional development practices of part-time instructors at selected League for Innovation community colleges. Report of the League for Innovation in the Community College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 269 093).

Zelan, J. (1987, September/October). Quality is the question [Letter to the editor]. Change, p.6.

Appendix A

Survey Instrument and Follow-up Reminders

Fullerton College Part-time Faculty Survey

Please read this before completing the questionnaire.

- The objective of this survey is to study the part-time faculty of Fullerton College in order to find ways to make your job as a part-time instructor better. Your responses to this questionnaire will provide the necessary information for planning future faculty development activities for part-time faculty members, and for planning ways to integrate part-time faculty more fully into Fullerton College.

- The code number which appears in the upper right corner of the questionnaire will be used for follow-up in case of non-response. Results will be reported in summary form only. Your responses will be strictly confidential.

- After the results of the survey have been tabulated, a summary of the results will be sent to all part-time faculty members. In addition, the full report on the part-time faculty of Fullerton College will be available in the Fullerton College Library by May, 1989.

- Full participation of all Fullerton College Part-Time Instructors is critically important for the success of this study. Because this survey will be used in planning to meet the needs of the part-time faculty, your accurate and complete responses are very important.

Thank you very much for your assistance!

Please return your completed survey to Diana Kelly. (Drop in "campus" slot in the Mailroom.)

[Additional space available on the reverse side for your comments.]

If you would like to be interviewed as a part of this study on part-time teaching at Fullerton College, please detach this sheet from the survey, and return it separately with the following information:

Name (please print)_____

Daytime phone (____)_____ Evening phone (____)_____

Best times to call_____

Issues or concerns_____

Return to Diana Kelly (through Mailroom)

Fullerton College Part-time Faculty Survey
Fall, 1988

Part One: Teaching Methods

Please keep in mind that none of the following methods of teaching or grading are "right" or "wrong." Some methods lend themselves more to certain classes than to others.

1. Which teaching methods do you use the most? Please check all that apply.

_____ Lecture
_____ Class discussions
_____ Small group discussions
_____ Hands-on activities
_____ Videotapes
_____ Slides
_____ other_____

_____ Overhead transperencies
_____ Audio tapes
_____ guest lectures
_____ writing activities during class
_____ question and answer reviews of material
_____ computer-aided instruction

2. Which forms of evaluation do you use in grading your students? (check all that apply)

_____ class attendance
_____ tardiness in attendance
_____ penalties for missed deadlines for class assignments
_____ class participation
_____ graded in-class writing activities
_____ a formal research paper (footnotes and bibliography)
_____ a written report (without footnotes and bibliography)
_____ oral reports in class
_____ formal speeches in class
_____ group projects prepared in class
_____ group projects prepared outside of class
_____ regular homework assignments
_____ regular writing assignments
_____ independent research on a subject of interest to the student
_____ interviews of content experts conducted by students outside of class
_____ other_____

_____ oral quizzes
_____ pop quizzes
_____ multiple-choice tests
_____ true-false tests
_____ short-answer tests
_____ fill-in tests
_____ essay tests
_____ Midterm exam
_____ cumulative Final exam
_____ non-cumulative Final
_____ open-book tests
_____ keeping a journal
_____ lab projects in class

3. What do you hand out to students at the beginning of the semester? (check all that apply)

_____ nothing -- they take notes on class requirements
_____ a course outline/syllabus
_____ a week-by-week class schedule
_____ grading criteria for the class
_____ other_____

Part Two: Faculty Development

This section is intended to assess your interest in faculty development activities. Future faculty development activities for part-time faculty members will be based on your responses.

4. If workshops were held on the following topics, which ones would you be interested in attending in order to improve your teaching? (check all that apply)

_____teaching underprepared college students
_____teaching bilingual ESL college students
_____teaching adult and re-entry college students
_____teaching high-risk students
_____motivational techniques for the classroom
_____how to increase your retention of students
_____college teaching techniques
_____how to incorporate new teaching methods
_____teaching vocational classes
_____including writing in classes
_____including critical thinking in classes
_____ grading procedures
_____how to propose a new course
_____how to write a course outline
_____content-specific workshops (for departments)
_____preparation of course materials
_____Fullerton College policies
_____legal issues relating to students
_____internationalizing the curriculum
_____how to market your classes
_____working with high schools
_____college transfer issues
_____current issues in Higher Education
_____interpersonal communication
_____physical wellness
_____time management
_____stress reduction
_____computer workshops
_____college strategic planning
_____division activities
_____Other_____

5. If such workshops were held, at what times would you be available to attend? (check all that apply)

_____ Weekdays between 8 a.m. and noon
_____ Weekdays between 11a.m. and 1p.m.
_____ Weekdays between noon and three
_____ Weekdays between 3 and 6 p.m.
_____ Weekday evenings between 6 p.m. and 10p.m. (on non-teaching evenings)
_____ Saturday morning
_____ Saturday afternoon
_____ Sunday morning
_____ Sunday afternoon
_____other_____

6. Please check the times of the year you prefer for workshops. (check all that apply)

_____ Before the start of the Fall semester
_____ Before the start of the Spring semester
_____ During the summer
_____During the Fall semester
_____During the Spring semester
_____other_____

7. Would a booklet which addresses the above issues be helpful to you?(circle one) YES NO

8. When you started teaching part-time at Fullerton College, what <u>didn't</u> you know that you wished that you had known from the beginning? (If you are a new instructor, what information do you feel that you are lacking?)_____

_____

Part Three: Involvement in College and Division

9. How often do you talk to your Division Dean (on the phone or in person)? (circle one)
   once a week once a month twice a semester once a semester other_____
10. How often do you talk to your Department Chair (on the phone or in person)? (circle one)
   once a week once a month twice a semester once a semester other_____
11. How often do you talk to other faculty members in your department? (circle one)
   once a week once a month twice a semester once a semester other_____
12. How often do you talk to other faculty members outside your department? (circle one)
   once a week once a month twice a semester once a semester other_____
13. Would you like to meet more faculty members to talk more frequently? (circle one) YES NO
14. When you started teaching part-time, did you receive good guidance from an experienced full-time instructor? (circle one) YES NO
15. When you started teaching part-time, did you receive good guidance from an experienced part-time instructor? (circle one) YES NO
16. When you started teaching part-time, did you receive good guidance from the Division Dean or Department Chair? (circle one) YES NO
17. Do you receive regular memos from your Division Dean or Department Chair throughout the semester? (circle one) YES NO
18. Do you attend Division meetings or Department meetings throughout the semester? (circle one)
   YES NO
19. If you do not attend Division meetings, which of the following reasons apply? (check all that apply)
   _____not aware of division meetings _____unavailable to attend daytime meetings
   _____meetings are for full-time faculty _____meetings are only held at beginning of semesters
   other_____
20. Do you feel involved with Fullerton College? (circle one)
   strongly involved somewhat involved slightly involved not involved
21. Do you feel involved with your Division or Department at Fullerton College? (circle one)
   strongly involved somewhat involved slightly involved not involved
22. Would you like to become more involved with Fullerton College? (circle one) YES NO
23. Would you like to become more involved with your Division/Department?(circle one) YES NO
24. What could Fullerton College or your Division do to make your job as a part-time instructor better?
   _____

Part Four: Professional Profile

25. How long have you been teaching part-time at Fullerton College? (circle one)
   this is my first semester one semester one year 2 years 3 years 4 years 5 years
   6-10 years 11-15 years more than 15 years

26. Do you teach primarily day classes or evening classes? (circle one) DAY EVENING

27. Do you teach in more than one division or department at Fullerton College? YES NO

28. What is the approximate age of the students you usually teach? (circle one)

18-22 18-25 25-35 25-45 18-45 other_____

29. How many hours per week will you be teaching this fall semester at Fullerton College?

Lecture hours_____ Lab hours_____

30. How many different classes will you be teaching during this fall semester at Fullerton College?

(circle one) 1 2 3 4 5

31. How many students will you be teaching in the fall semester at Fullerton College? (circle one)

fewer than 20 20-29 30-39 40-49 50-59 60-69 70-79 80-89 90-99 over 100

32. Do you hope to eventually teach full-time? (circle one)

No at Fullerton College at another two-year college at another four-year college

33. Do you teach in a primarily vocational subject or a primarily academic subject? (circle one)

VOCATIONAL ACADEMIC

34. Are you currently working in the profession in which you teach? (circle one)

No Full-time Part-time Free-lance

35. Have you ever worked in the profession in which you teach? (circle one)

No Full-time Part-time Free-lance

36. How long ago did you last work in the profession in which you teach? (circle one)

Never One year ago 2 years ago 3 years ago 5 years ago 10 years ago More than 10 yrs

37. For what length of time did you work in the profession in which you teach? (circle one)

Never 1 year 2 years 3 years 5 years 10 years 15 years 20 years More than 20

38. Do you currently teach part-time at a school or college other than Fullerton College? (circle one)

No High School two-year college four-year college

39. Do you currently teach full-time at a school or college other than Fullerton College? (circle one)

No High School two-year college four-year college

40. How many total hours per week will you be teaching this fall semester at other colleges and schools?

None Lecture hours_____ Lab hours_____

41. How many different classes will you be teaching during this fall semester at other colleges/schools?

(circle one) None 1 2 3 4 5

42. How many total students will you be teaching this fall semester at other colleges/schools? (circle one)

none 1-20 20-29 30-39 40-49 50-59 60-69 70-79 80-89 90-99 over 100

Part Five: Personal Profile

43. Age (circle one) 20-29 30-39 40-49 50-59 60+ Gender (circle one) M F

44. Highest Degree Earned: High School Associate Bachelor Master Doctorate

Thank you very much for your help! [Additional comments may be made on the front sheet.]

It's not too late...
to turn in your faculty survey!

Things are pretty hectic at the beginning of the semester, and that part-time faculty survey you received two weeks ago may have been temporarily put aside. You are not alone. So far over 50% of the surveys have been returned, but we need yours to reach 100% return!

Your response is critically important to the success of this study of the Fullerton College part-time faculty!

All part-time faculty members are being surveyed in order to gain a complete and accurate picture of the characteristics and unique needs of the part-time faculty members of Fullerton College.

Please take a few minutes to fill out your survey and return it to Diana Kelly through the Mail Room at your earliest convenience.

Thank you very much for your help!

Diana Kelly

Diana Kelly
Communications Division Instructor

P.S. If your survey has become lost in the shuffle, please drop me a note, and I'll be happy to send you another copy.

Your Response is IMPORTANT!

I decided to study the community college part-time faculty for my Masters thesis in higher education for this reason:

Part-time faculty are a valuable asset to any college!

However, it's difficult for a college to understand the special needs of the part-time faculty without an accurate profile. Who are the part-time faculty? What is their professional background? What are their concerns and frustrations? Without this information, it would be difficult for any college to understand the part-time faculty.

Why is your response important?

Because nobody can fill out this survey for you! Your background and needs are different from those of any other part-time faculty member. Fullerton College has a very large (nearly 400) and diverse part-time faculty. Your interests, background, experiences, concerns, and needs will not be included unless you participate in this survey!

Your response will be strictly confidential.

Data from this survey will only be reported in summary form. Written comments will be reported anonymously.

The results of this study will be given to administration.

This study will give the administration an accurate picture of the part-time faculty which may be used for future decision-making and planning.

60% of the surveys have been returned.

100% return is essential to the success of this study.

Please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed survey at your earliest convenience.

Return your completed survey to Diana Kelly in the Mailroom.

You are important!
Don't be left out!

It only takes 5 minutes to let your voice be heard!

You're a busy person. But if you choose to ignore the Part-Time Faculty Survey, you're letting a good opportunity slip by.

Did you know that you are part of a very significant group?

- Over half of the instructors in community colleges are part-time.
- Relatively little is known about part-time instructors.
- This is the first effort in recent years to do a comprehensive study of the entire Fullerton College Part-Time Faculty.
- So far 73% of the part-time faculty have returned the survey.
- 100% return is essential to meet the needs of all part-time faculty!

This is your chance!

- Let your opinions be known.
- Your input will help to determine the future direction of professional development activities for part-time faculty at Fullerton College.

You received a second copy of the Part Time Faculty Survey a couple of weeks ago.

- It may look long, but the questions have been carefully constructed to allow you to fill it out very quickly.
- Feel free to add any comments about issues you are concerned about.
- It only takes about five minutes to fill out the survey.

Please return your completed survey to Diana Kelly in the campus mailroom as soon as possible.

(Please let me know if you need another copy of the survey. I will be happy to send you one.)

To: [faculty name]
From: Diana Kelly
Date: November 14, 1988

Please complete the attached Part Time Faculty survey and return promptly. Thank you.

Appendix B
Part-Time Faculty Survey Response Frequencies

V-A	Division	Frequency	Valid Percent
1.	Biology	6	1.9%
2.	Business	82	26.1%
3.	Communications	11	3.5%
4.	Fine Arts	31	9.9%
5.	Home Economics	11	3.5%
6.	Humanities	50	15.9%
7.	Library	1	.3%
8.	Math	29	9.2%
9.	Physical Education	10	3.2%
10.	Physical Sciences	6	1.9%
11.	Social Sciences	30	9.6%
12.	Student Services	5	1.6%
13.	Technical Education	42	13.4%
		314	100%

V1 Which teaching methods do you use the most? (multiple responses: in order of frequency)

		Frequency	Valid Percent
1.	Lecture	294	93.6%
2.	Class discussions	235	74.8%
3.	Question & answer review of material	167	53.2%
4.	Hands-on activities	161	51.3%
5.	Small group discussions	103	32.8%
6.	Overhead transparencies	100	31.8%
7.	Videotapes	95	30.3%
8.	Writing activities during class	93	29.6%
9.	Guest lectures	52	16.6%
10.	Slides	43	13.7%
11.	Audio tapes	32	10.2%
12.	Computer-aided instruction	30	9.6%
13.	Other	38	12.1%
	• films	9	
	• demonstrations	7	
	• chalkboard	5	
	• field trips	3	
	• handouts	2	
	• workshop	2	
	• visual aids	2	
	• roleplay	1	
	• calculator-aided instruction	1	
	• computer demonstrations	1	
	• student papers on opaque projector	1	
	• samples	1	
	• small group activity drills	1	
	• skills testing	1	
	• jigsawing	1	

V2 What forms of evaluation do you use in grading your students?

	(multiple responses: in order of frequency)	Frequency	Valid Percent
1.	Class attendence	227	72.3%
2.	Cumulative final exam	187	59.6%
3.	Class participation	185	58.9%
4.	Multiple choice tests	182	58.0%
5.	Regular homework assignments	169	53.8%
6.	Midterm exam	162	51.6%
7.	Short-answer tests	152	48.4%
8.	Penalties for missed deadlines for assignments	139	44.3%
9.	True-false tests	122	38.9%
10.	Fill-in tests	120	38.2%
11.	Essay tests	107	34.1%
12.	Lab projects in class	84	26.8%
13.	Graded in-class writing activities	77	24.5%
14.	Regular writing assignments	75	23.9%
15.	Non-cumulative final exam	70	22.3%
16.	Written report (w/out footnotes/bibliography)	69	22.0%
17.	Tardiness in attendence	68	21.7%
18.	Pop quizzes	66	21.0%
19.	Oral reports in class	61	19.4%
20.	Group projects prepared in class	50	15.9%
21.	Keeping a journal	47	15.0%
22.	Open-book tests	45	14.3%
23.	Independent research on student-selected topic	44	14.0%
24.	Group projects prepared outside of class	34	10.8%
24.	Formal research paper (footnotes/bibliography)	34	10.8%
25.	Oral quizzes	33	10.5%
26.	Interviews of experts conducted out of class	14	4.5%
26.	Formal speeches in class	14	4.5%
27.	Other	65	20.7%

[NOTE: all respondents did not elaborate on the specific "other" evaluation methods used.]

- student performances 6
- skill progress during semester 3
- notebook 3
- problem-solving assignments 3
- book reviews 2
- final project 2
- take-home final exam 2
- craftsmanship & aesthetics of projects 1
- outside reading 1
- prepared tests for welding certification 1
- weekly vocabulary quizzes 1
- programming assignments 1
- optional enrichment assignments 1
- chapter tests 1
- preparation of court printed documents 1
- small group problem-solving assignments 1
- individual projects prepared outside of class 1
- students must keep detailed record of grades 1
- map assignments 1
- group testing 1
- attitude 1
- ability to follow instructions 1

V3 What do you hand out to students at the beginning of the semester?

	(multiple responses: in order of frequency.)	Frequency	Valid Percent
1.	A course outline/syllabus	304	96.8%
2.	Grading criteria for the class	295	93.9%
3.	A week-by-week class schedule	200	63.7%
4.	Nothing: students take notes on requirements	9	2.9%
5.	Other	68	21.7%

[NOTE: some respondants offered more than one "other" handout.]

- schedules pertaining to class activities 7
- student information sheet/questionaire 6
- a list of assignments 5
- materials required 4
- expectations and objectives of the course 4
- additional class material 3
- pertinent material not supplied in text 3
- lab requirements 3
- policy manual and guidelines 2
- attendence criteria 2
- study sheet 2
- bibliography 2
- anything that might help in this class 2
- glossary of terms 2
- notes on material covered 2
- answers to problems 2
- extra exercises 2
- writing sample 1
- casette recording 1
- project descriptions 1
- list of art museums and galleries 1
- pre-test (not counted for grade) 1
- speed reading & lecture note-taking tips 1
- copy of policy on "Academic Honesty" 1
- what I expect of them 1
- class procedures 1
- project report 1
- forms for assignments 1
- first week assignment ideas 1
- articles from magazines for discussion 1
- a book of all handouts needed 1
- safety information and safety tests 1
- my resume 1
- college paperwork 1
- student grade record sheet 1
- grade contract 1
- information on course journal 1
- news items on subject matter 1
- guidelines for class participation 1
- suggestions for term papers 1
- information sheet 1
- office and home phone of instructor 1

V4 If workshops were held on the following topics, which ones would you be interested in attending in order to improve your teaching? (multiple responses: in order of frequency)

		Frequency	Valid Percent
1.	Motivational techniques for the classroom	142	45.2%
2.	How to incorporate new teaching methods	114	36.3%
3.	College teaching techniques	104	33.1%
4.	How to increase your retention of students	94	30.0%
5.	Teaching underprepared college students	88	28.0%
6.	Computer workshops	79	25.2%
7.	Teaching adult and re-entry students	71	22.6%
8.	Including critical thinking in classes	67	21.3%
9.	Stress reduction	63	20.0%
10.	How to market your classes	61	19.4%
11.	How to propose a new course	57	18.2%
12.	Time Management	56	17.8%
13.	Teaching bilingual ESL students	46	14.6%
14.	Teaching high-risk students	42	13.3%
15.	Teaching vocational classes	41	13.1%
16.	Grading procedures	40	12.7%
16.	Fullerton College policies	40	12.7%
17.	How to write a course outline	39	12.4%
18.	Preparation of course materials	36	11.5%
18.	Current issues in higher education	36	11.5%
19.	Content-specific workshops in departments	34	10.8%
20.	Interpersonal communication	33	10.5%
21.	Division activities	30	9.6%
21.	Physical wellness	30	9.6%
22.	Legal issues relating to students	27	8.6%
23.	Including writing in classes	26	8.3%
23.	Working with high schools	26	8.3%
23.	College transfer issues	26	8.3%
24.	Internationalizing the curriculum	23	7.3%
25.	College strategic planning	7	2.2%
26.	Other	6	1.9%
	• Industry/job related math utilization	1	
	• computing skills/programming	1	
	• workshop on leading class discussions	1	
	• student communication apprehension	1	
	• interviewing techniques	1	
	• community needs: hiring a graduate	1	

V5 If such workshops were held, at what times would you be able to attend? (multiple responses: in order of frequency)

		Frequency	Valid Percent
1.	Non-teaching weekday evenings 6-10 p.m.	159	50.6%
2.	Saturday mornings	136	43.3%
3.	Saturday afternoons	79	25.2%
4.	Weekdays 3-6 p.m.	63	20.0%
5.	Weekdays 8 a.m. - noon	45	14.3%
5.	Weekdays noon - 3 p.m.	45	14.3%
6.	Sunday afternoons	42	13.4%
7.	Sunday mornings	38	12.1%
8.	Other: Friday nights	1	.3%

V6 What times of the year do you prefer for workshops?

(multiple responses: in order of frequency)	Frequency	Valid Percent
1. During the fall semester	146	46.5%
2. Before the start of the spring semester	123	39.2%
3. During the spring semeser	117	37.3%
4. Before the start of the fall semester	109	34.7%
5. During the summer	61	19.4%
6. Other	23	7.3%
• too busy: no time	16	
• anytime	4	
• as a flex-day option	2	
• during spring break	1	

V7 Would an information booklet be helpful? (Missing Responses=18; 5.7% of total)

	Frequency	Valid Percent
1. Yes	244	82.4%
2. No	52	17.6%
	296	100%

V8 When you started teaching part-time at Fullerton College, what didn't you know that you wished you had known from the beginning? [Note: this was an open-ended question.]

Comments	Frequency	Valid Percent
A. Satisfied with orientation	13	4.1%

- Received great support from Business Division: lack of information was not a problem.
- I was well-informed by the Music Department.
- The Humanities Division and English Department prepped me well and were available for any questions.
- My department gave me a very thorough orientation. Other faculty volunteered information and help was always available.
- My beginning was excellent.
- I was given an excellent orientation and introduction to the college. No problems here!
- I had several friends already teaching here who told me what I needed to know.
- No problems so far!
- The orientation was fine.
- It has been a very enjoyable experience.
- Nothing: I was well indoctrinated.
- Felt competent and supported by Business Division Dean. All went well. Thank you!
- Nothing -- my department keeps me well informed.

Comments	Frequency	Valid Percent
B. College policies & procedures	61	19.4%
• College policies.	[12]	
• Grading policies & procedures.	[10]	
• Administrative procedures.	[5]	
• Record keeping procedures.	[4]	
• Student drop policies & drop schedule	[4]	
• Student discipline policies.	[2]	
• Student attendence policies.	[2]	

- Student assessment tests: types of tests given to students, requirements to enter college, who has authority to refer a student to a certain class. [2]
- Instructor handbook of rules and regulations.
- Unwritten college policies.
- How the system works: financial aid, testing, counseling, scheduling, etc.
- Who is in charge of what.
- Proper channels to go through.

V8 When you started teaching part-time at Fullerton College, what didn't you know that you wished you had known from the beginning? [continued]

B. College policies & procedures (continued)

- Knowledge of A.A. degree requirements.
- Transfer requirements.
- Information about other departments to pass on to students.
- How to propose a new course.
- Length and time of class breaks.
- Paperwork samples.
- Information about flex hours.
- Information on certification system.
- Classroom and student regulations.
- Policies concerning evening and weekend use of facilities.
- How to check on student educational background.
- Counseling process.
- Learning skills center requirements.
- Personnel in the administration office.
- Procedures for proposing a new course.

Comments	Frequency	Valid Percent
C. Division/Department Policies	16	5.0%
• Knowledge of class requirements.	[2]	
• Need to meet more faculty in my division.	[2]	
• Departmental policies and practices.	[2]	

- Course procedures.
- Better understanding of how my course fits in the overall curriculum.
- How difficult is "rigorous" at this level? I want to be sure my class is about the level of the others.
- Expectations of teachers in sequential classes for my students.
- Criteria for students to take my class.
- Orientation to the philosophy of the department.
- Would like to have met the other instructors in the department: this would have led to answering questions as they occurred.
- I'd like to share teaching experiences with other faculty in my department.
- More help from members of the department.
- Nobody has ever advised me on departmental policies without my asking first.

Comments	Frequency	Valid Percent
D. Teaching techniques	32	10.2%
• How to teach a class: basic teaching techniques.	[5]	
• At what speed to plan presentations.	[2]	
• How to prepare a lecture.	[2]	
• Time management.	[2]	
• How to hold down student attrition.	[2]	
• How to incorporate new teaching methods.	[2]	

- Course preperation.
- How to more fully develop a single topic.
- Coordination of homework assignments, presentation of new material, giving tests, and reviewing tests.
- How to teach the lab assignments.
- A students' perspective of the instructor.
- Extemporaneous speaking ability
- How to adapt a course to student needs.
- Class management.

V8 When you started teaching part-time at Fullerton College, what didn't you know that you wished you had known from the beginning? [continued]

D. Teaching techniques (continued)

- How to organize a class to allow for more individualized attention.
- Class work schedule
- How to communicate to a class.
- How to motivate underprepared students.
- How much homework to assign.
- How to teach adult students.
- How to teach high-risk students.
- How to meet the needs of disabled students.
- How to write a course outline.

Comments	Frequency	Valid Percent
E. Teaching Aids	17	5.4%

- Availability of help for reproduction & typing. [4]
- How to get AV equipment into the classroom. [3]
- Availability of audio-visual materials. [2]
- Operation of audio-visual equipment. [2]
- Availability of computer resources.
- Where equipment and supplies to teach lab were placed. It would be nice if the prep room had a directory!
- How to make sure that the textbook is in the bookstore for my students.
- Needed textbook with instructor guide.
- Course outline.
- How the computer lab is set up and operated.

Comments	Frequency	Valid Percent
F. Information about Fullerton College.	13	4.1%

- Where to park. [4]
- A campus tour and map. [3]
- Survival skills: bathroom and snackbar location, location of class, mailboxes, etc.[2]
- A class schedule and catalog.
- Services available to evening students.
- Support services at Fullerton College.
- Better all-around communication.

Comments	Frequency	Valid Percent
G. Information about the working conditions.	33	10.5%

- Lack of full-time opportunities. [5]
- Salary schedule and pay increases. [4]
- Everything about pay (how, what, when). [3]
- The high drop-out rate. [3]
- The number of underprepared students. [2]
- That I might be required to teach off campus. [2]
- How much outside time is involved in preparation and grading.[2]
- Sick day availability.
- Low pay, long hours.
- That I wouldn't have office space. I badly need a quiet undisturbed place to hold office hours to work with my students because they write every week.
- That classes are often cancelled or combined.
- How ill-prepared students are in oral and written communication skills.
- Characteristics of low-achievement students.
- Students' level of education.

V8 When you started teaching part-time at Fullerton College, what didn't you know that you wished you had known from the beginning? [continued]

G. Information about the working conditions. (continued)

- I did not know that some of the students would be so unmotivated. They are just like my high school students.
- Information on all services offered here.
- That there would be no lab assistants available.
- That more electives in my department are not available as they are at Cypress college.
- That classrooms had been moved.

Comments	Frequency	Valid Percent
H. Other	4	1.3%

- Terms of academia: "Matriculation," "articulation,""transfer," "vocational," etc. [2]
- Correlating high school and college curriculum
- How to market my class.

V9 How often do you talk to your Division Dean? (Missing Responses=5; 1.9% of total)

[for those not new this semester]	Frequency	Valid Percent
1. Once per week	45	17.7%
2. Once per month	67	26.4%
3. Twice per semester	44	17.3%
4. Once per semester	54	21.3%
5. More than once per week	8	3.1%
6. Seldom/Never	22	8.7%
7. As needed	9	3.5%
8. Other	5	2.0%
	254	100%

V10 How often do you talk to your Department Chair? (Missing Responses=11; 4.2% of total)

[for those not new this semester]	Frequency	Valid Percent
1. Once per week	70	28.2%
2. Once per month	72	29.0%
3. Twice per semester	36	14.5%
4. Once per semester	36	14.5%
5. More than once per week	15	6.0%
6. Seldom/Never	9	3.6%
7. As needed	7	2.8%
8. Other	3	1.2%
	248	100%

V11 How often do you talk to faculty in your division? (Missing responses=7; 2.7% of total)

[for those not new this semester]	Frequency	Valid Percent
1. Once per week	132	52.4%
2. Once per month	32	12.7%
3. Twice per semester	23	9.1%
4. Once per semester	16	6.3%
5. More than once per week	24	9.5%
6. Seldom/Never	20	7.9%
7. As needed	1	.4%
8. Other	4	1.6%
	252	100%

V12 How often do you talk to faculty outside your division? (Missing responses=17; 6.6%)

[for those not new this semester]	Frequency	Valid Percent
1. Once per week	39	16.1%
2. Once per month	33	13.6%
3. Twice per semester	22	9.1%
4. Once per semester	44	18.2%
5. More than once per week	8	3.3%
6. Seldom/Never	89	36.8%
7. As needed	0	0.0%
8. Other	7	2.9%
	242	100%

V13 Would you like to meet more faculty? (Missing responses=22; 8.5% of total)

[for those not new this semester]	Frequency	Valid Percent
1. Yes	126	53.2%
2. No	111	46.8%
	290	100%

V14 Did you receive guidance from a full-time faculty member? (Missing responses=3; 1.2%)

[for those not new this semester]	Frequency	Valid Percent
1. Yes	144	56.3%
2. No	112	43.8%
	256	100%

V15 Did you receive guidance from a part-time faculty member? (Missing responses=11; 4.2%)

[for those not new this semester]	Frequency	Valid Percent
1. Yes	72	29.0%
2. No	176	71.0%
	248	100%

V16 Did you receive guidance from your Div. Dean/Dept. Chair? (Missing responses=7; 2.7%)

[for those not new this semester]	Frequency	Valid Percent
1. Yes	174	69.0%
2. No	78	31.0%
	252	100%

V17 Do you receive regular memos from your Division Dean? (Missing responses=1; .4%)

[for those not new this semester]	Frequency	Valid Percent
1. Yes	225	87.2%
2. No	33	12.8%
	258	100%

V18 Do you attend Division meetings? (Missing responses=2; .8% of total)

[for those not new this semester]	Frequency	Valid Percent
1. Yes	45	17.5%
2. No	212	82.5%
	257	100%

V19 If you do not attend Division meetings, why not? (Missing responses=5; 2.4% of total)
[for those not new this semester] (**NOTE:** Only those who answered "no" to V18 were tabulated.)

		Frequency	Valid Percent
1.	Not aware of division meetings.	21	10.1%
2.	Meetings are for full-time faculty.	29	14.0%
3.	Unavailable to attend meetings.	68	32.9%
4.	Meetings only at beginning of sem.	8	3.9%
5.	Answers 1,2.	13	6.3%
6.	Answers 1,2,3.	14	6.8%
7.	Answers 1,3.	13	6.3%
8.	Answers 2,3,4.	2	1.0%
9.	Answers 1,4	1	.5%
10.	Answers 2,3	25	12.1%
11.	Answers 3,4	4	1.9%
12.	Answers 1,3,4	1	.5%
13.	Answers 1,2,4	1	.5%
14.	Answers 2,4.	3	1.4%
15.	Answers 1,2,3,4.	1	.5%
16.	Other	3	1.4%
		207	100%

V20 Do you feel involved with Fullerton College? (Missing responses=1; .4% of total)

	[for those not new this semester]	Frequency	Valid Percent
1.	Strongly involved	40	15.5%
2.	Somewhat involved	95	36.8%
3.	Slightly involved	94	36.4%
4.	Not involved	29	11.2%
		258	100%

V21 Do you feel involved with your Division or Department? (Missing responses=2; .8%)

	[for those not new this semester]	Frequency	Valid Percent
1.	Strongly involved	56	21.8%
2.	Somewhat involved	111	43.2%
3.	Slightly involved	71	27.6%
4.	Not involved	19	7.4%
		257	100%

V22 Would you like more involvement with Fullerton College? (Missing responses=15; 5.8%)

	[for those not new this semester]	Frequency	Valid Percent
1.	Yes	149	61.1%
2.	No	95	33.9%
		244	100%

V23 Would you like more involvement with your Div./Dept.? (Missing responses=17; 6.6%)

	[for those not new this semester]	Frequency	Valid Percent
1.	Yes	160	66.1%
2.	No	82	33.9%
		242	100%

V24 What could Fullerton College or your Division do to make your job as a part-time instructor better? [NOTE: This was an open-ended question.]

Comments	Frequency	Valid Percent
A. Satisfied with Fullerton College	37	11.8%

- Nothing -- everything is fine. [12]
- I am quite satisfied that all has been done to make me as comfortable as possible.
- I'm well satisfied.
- They do everything that I need.
- Not much! Humanities Division has been fantastic!
- Good job!
- Nothing. Everyone is helpful whenever needed.
- The college and my division have been very supportive and helpful.
- Everything has been good the past 15 years.
- Nothing: my needs are being met.
- I am pleased the way it is now.
- They truly do enough.
- I am happy with this association.
- My division has done a fine job.
- Nothing -- they are very cooperative.
- The supervision and support provided by the Business Division is outstanding! Appreciated very much by me.
- Remain as available and as concerned and encouraging as they have been.
- The division has been quite helpful.
- They do a good job. I feel "at home" here.
- I am pleased with the department and division support.
- Job is great. It would be tough to improve.
- I am satisfied with my division arrangements at present.
- Everything is working out pretty well.
- I think the cooperation is excellent, including the Communications Division Secretary.
- The Home Economics Department has gone far to help me and make me feel welcome.
- My division is very organized. I know they are there should I need help.

Comments	Frequency	Valid Percent
B. Teaching load	17	5.4%

- Hire me full-time. [10]
- Add to my teaching load. [4]
- Hire more full-time positions.
- Allow me to teach more than 10 hours per week!
- I like my part-time job. I wish I had more hours and classes.

Comments	Frequency	Valid Percent
C. Salary and Benefits	18	5.7%

- Increase salary and benefits. [5]
- Provide benefits. [3]
- Award day contracts to part-time faculty or increase extended day pay scale.
- Pay comparable to daytime.
- Pay us for all the overtime: for scoring holistic essays, etc.
- Pro-rata pay.
- Pay a professional salary.
- Get me a raise.
- Benefits, security, sick days, holidays, seniority, more pay.
- Explain any fringe benefits available to us.
- Have some benefits: retirement, medical, professional time.
- Offer benefits such as insurance. Even a group rate program would be helpful.

V24 What could Fullerton College or your Division do to make your job as a part-time instructor better? [continued]

Comments	Frequency	Valid Percent
D. Status of Part-Time Faculty	15	4.8%

- Treat part-timers with more respect and invite them to participate.
- Increase our status with full-time faculty.
- Due respect as a functioning part of the total FC staff.
- Include part-time instructors.
- Be non-demeaning/arrogant toward part-timers.
- Do I feel important? Sometimes . . .
- Do not look at us as part-time instructors.
- Recognize part-time instructors: list with full-time faculty, provide ID cards, provide some benefits, etc.
- Notice we're here. Part-timers are not a "real part of the school." Look in the directory.
- My name is not in the personnel directory.
- Improve the status of part-timers.
- Validate our contributions to the college and the community.
- Perhaps make part-time people feel like more of a part of a team.
- I love Fullerton College. I graduated here. Make part-time instructors feel like we belong and are not just a convenience for them to fill a vacant spot no one else wants.
- Listen to what I have to say. Nobody asks. I feel uneasy when I have a comment or suggestion. I don't think anybody wants it.

Comments	Frequency	Valid Percent
E. Time Constraints	4	1.3%

- Working a full-time administrative job severly limits what I'm available to do.
- Doing fine. My lack of time and availability is the obstacle at this point.
- It's a tough question. I teach at two other colleges.
- Fix the gridlock on the freeways!

Comments	Frequency	Valid Percent
F. Facilities and Office space	18	5.7%

- Office space and a phone. [5]
- Give me an office and regular office hours. [3]
- Clerical support. [2]
- Provide additional storage facilities for paperwork. [2]
- Could use a desk or file space on campus.
- My class is scheduled until 10:30 p.m. and many times I do not leave until 11:30 due to cleaning up, etc. During this period from 6 p.m. to 11:30 p.m. I do not have access to a telephone (only a pay phone downstairs and a half block away). For safety reasons I would like access to a phone quickly!
- Better facilities for overhead transparencies.
- Stabilize classroom assignments on FC campus.
- Make available the same computer facilities that are at hand to full-time instructors in a general office, possibly.
- Increase access to technical equipment.

Comments	Frequency	Valid Percent
G. College Policies and Procedures	5	1.6%

- Provide easy parking.
- Be more precise on paychecks: pay period covers which days and hours worked, which are college and which are Adult Ed.
- Make enrollment easier.

V24 What could Fullerton College or your Division do to make your job as a part-time instructor better? [continued]

Comments	Frequency	Valid Percent
D. Status of Part-Time Faculty	15	4.8%

- Treat part-timers with more respect and invite them to participate.
- Increase our status with full-time faculty.
- Due respect as a functioning part of the total FC staff.
- Include part-time instructors.
- Be non-demeaning/arrogant toward part-timers.
- Do I feel important? Sometimes . . .
- Do not look at us as part-time instructors.
- Recognize part-time instructors: list with full-time faculty, provide ID cards, provide some benefits, etc.
- Notice we're here. Part-timers are not a "real part of the school." Look in the directory.
- My name is not in the personnel directory.
- Improve the status of part-timers.
- Validate our contributions to the college and the community.
- Perhaps make part-time people feel like more of a part of a team.
- I love Fullerton College. I graduated here. Make part-time instructors feel like we belong and are not just a convenience for them to fill a vacant spot no one else wants.
- Listen to what I have to say. Nobody asks. I feel uneasy when I have a comment or suggestion. I don't think anybody wants it.

Comments	Frequency	Valid Percent
E. Time Constraints	4	1.3%

- Working a full-time administrative job severly limits what I'm available to do.
- Doing fine. My lack of time and availability is the obstacle at this point.
- It's a tough question. I teach at two other colleges.
- Fix the gridlock on the freeways!

Comments	Frequency	Valid Percent
F. Facilities and Office space	18	5.7%

- Office space and a phone. [5]
- Give me an office and reguler office hours. [3]
- Clerical support. [2]
- Provide additional storage facilities for paperwork. [2]
- Could use a desk or file space on campus.
- My class is scheduled until 10:30 p.m. and many times I do not leave until 11:30 due to cleaning up, etc. During this period from 6 p.m. to 11:30 p.m. I do not have access to a telephone (only a pay phone downstairs and a half block away). For safety reasons I would like access to a phone quickly!
- Better facilities for overhead transparencies.
- Stabilize classroom assignments on FC campus.
- Make available the same computer facilities that are at hand to full-time instructors in a general office, possibly.
- Increase access to technical equipment.

Comments	Frequency	Valid Percent
G. College Policies and Procedures	5	1.6%

- Provide easy parking.
- Be more precise on paychecks: pay period covers which days and hours worked, which are college and which are Adult Ed.
- Make enrollment easier.

V24 What could Fullerton College or your Division do to make your job as a part-time instructor better? [continued]

G. College Policies and Procedures (continued)

- Start the fall semester in September, not August 16.
- I like my students at FC, but I get very frustrated at the rigid and numerous rules at FC and the necessity for two mailboxes to check and wrestle with. I am not happy at my current classroom site being so far from parking. Take the locks off mailboxes! Consolidate mailboxes, give me classrooms near the department office, and give me parking near my rooms.

Comments	Frequency	Valid Percent
H. Division and Department Meetings	14	4.5%

- Be invited to department meetings and workshops. [2]
- Meetings with full-time faculty.
- Have meetings that include part-time faculty.
- Be made aware of division meetings involving teaching procedures.
- More meetings after 4 p.m. for other part-time faculty.
- Regular meetings with part-time faculty.
- Have evening department meetings/workshops for part-time instructors.
- Joint meetings with day instructors.
- Invitations to department meetings.
- Our part-time faculty never meets as a whole.
- Set up meetings to coordinate subjects.
- Department meetings should be open to part-timers.
- This year was the first time I was invited to the luncheon at the beginning of the semester. That was nice!

Comments	Frequency	Valid Percent
I. Curriculum and Planning Input	14	4.5%

- Allow us to give more course input.
- Listen to our input regarding subject matter.
- Set up a procedure so that those most senior in the department are guaranteed first choice on open sections for scheduling.
- Allow part-time faculty input into the strategic plan of the department.
- Let me know how my class fits into the overall curriculum.
- Involve part-time instructors in department decisions.
- Don't schedule classes during peak freeway hours.
- More class offerings in my subject.
- A variety of teaching assignments.
- Let me teach more advanced courses.
- Getting all teachers to agree on a new lecture book.
- Would like to know what supplemental materials other faculty use in addition to text.
- Get class material, student rosters, and other materials at least a week before the class begins to prepare and plan.
- Improve/replace the worn and outdated lab equipment.

Comments	Frequency	Valid Percent
J. Communication & Integration	11	3.5%

- More communication. [5]
- As a minimum it would help to be consulted/considered or at least advised when the night or time of the class I've taught for years is changed.
- More contact.
- Orientations on equipment and teaching procedures.

V24 What could Fullerton College or your Division do to make your job as a part-time instructor better? [continued]

J. Communication & Integration (continued)

- Having been employed at FC as a full-time sabbatical replacement for one semester really helped in these areas: involvement with the college and deaprtment. More contact (professional and social) with the full-time faculty would be nice.
- More communication between part-time instructors.
- More personal contact, input, and feedback.

Comments	Frequency	Valid Percent
K. Teaching conditions	8	2.5%

- Provide money for teaching aids. [3]
- We need math motivational material for industry/job-related areas.
- Have all ESL students take an ESL placement test so that placement in classes is more effective.
- Placement of students in classes is a concern.
- Better prepared students.
- Screen students for right classes. Mostly I have students from different extremes.

Comments	Frequency	Valid Percent
L. Staff Development	11	3.5%

- Provide mini-courses on subjects listed in question 4 at convenient times, no more than 2-3 hours in length. [2]
- Have occasional meetings and/or workshops that apply to part-time instructors.
- Create workshops or meetings for us to exchange ideas and to bond as a group or community.
- Sharing with other instructors.
- Presentations on particular populations of students.
- Conduct workshops on a volunteer basis.
- A booklet with specifics: payroll, parking, holidays, phone numbers, map, etc.
- When I first started teaching I would have liked some professional feedback.
- Give evaluations more frequently
- Eliminate flex hours: add back the additional class meeting.

V25 How long have you been teaching part-time at Fullerton College? (Missing=1; .3% of total)

		Frequency	Valid Percent
1.	This is the first semester	54	17.3%
2.	One semester	15	4.8%
3.	One Year	44	14.1%
4.	Two years	30	9.6%
5.	Three years	19	6.1%
6.	Four years	20	6.4%
7.	Five years	18	5.8%
8.	Six to Ten years	50	16.0%
9.	Eleven to Fifteen years	34	10.9%
10.	Over Fifteen years	29	9.3%
		313	100%

V26 Do you teach primarily day or evening classes? (Missing responses=3; 1.0)

		Frequency	Valid Percent
1.	Day	69	22.2%
2.	Evening	227	73.0%
3.	Both	15	4.8%
		311	100%

V27 Do you teach in more than one division at Fullerton College? (Missing=2; .6% of total)

	Frequency	Valid Percent
1. Yes	6	1.9%
2. No	306	98.1%
	312	100%

V28 What is the approximate age of the students you teach? (Missing=12; 3.8% of total)

	Frequency	Valid Percent
1. 18-22	16	5.3%
2. 18-25	109	36.1%
3. 25-35	51	16.9%
4. 25-45	34	11.3%
5. 18-45	82	27.2%
6. Other	10	3.3%
	302	100%

V29 How many hours per week do you teach at Fullerton this semester? (Missing=3; 1.0)

Hours	Frequency	Valid Percent
2 hours	6	1.9%
3 hours	87	27.7%
4 hours	37	11.8%
5 hours	42	13.4%
6 hours	44	14.0%
7 hours	6	1.9%
8 hours	36	11.5%
9 hours	29	9.2%
10 hours	8	2.5%
11 hours	5	1.6%
12 hours	5	1.6%
14 hours	1	.3%
15 hours	1	.3%
18 hours (this may not be accurate)	2	.6%
24 hours (this may not be accurate)	2	.6%
Mean: 5.71 Median: 5.0 Mode: 3.0	311	100%

V30 How many different classes do you teach at Fullerton this semester? (Missing=3; 1.0%)

Classes	Frequency	Valid Percent
1 class	201	64.0%
2 classes	80	25.5%
3 classes	24	7.6%
4 classes	4	1.3%
5 classes	1	.3%
6 classes	1	.3%
Mean: 1.46 Median: 1.0 Mode: 1.0	311	100%

V31 How many students do you teach at Fullerton this semester? (Missing=9; 2.9% of total)

Students	Frequency	Valid Percent
1. less than 20	37	12.1%
2. 20-29	81	26.6%
3. 30-39	58	19.0%
4. 40-49	42	13.8%
5. 50-59	24	7.9%
6. 60-69	15	4.9%
7. 70-79	22	7.2%
8. 80-89	9	3.0%
9. 90-99	6	2.0%
10. 100 or more	11	3.6%
(Part-time faculty teach about 12,000 students.)	305	100%

V32 Do you hope to eventually teach full time? (Missing responses=6; 1.9% of total)

	Frequency	Valid Percent
1. No	135	43.8%
2. Fullerton College	104	33.8%
3. Another 2-year college	9	2.9%
4. Another 4-year college	19	6.2%
5. Answers 2,3	18	5.8%
6. Answers 2,3,4	17	5.5%
7. Answers 2,4	5	1.6%
8. Answers 3,4	1	.3%
	308	100%

V33 Do you teach a vocational or academic subject? (Missing responses=7; 2.2% of total)

	Frequency	Valid Percent
1. Vocational	124	40.4%
2. Academic	183	59.6%
	307	100%

V34 Are you currently working in the profession in which you teach? (Missing=7; 2.2% of total)

	Frequency	Valid Percent
1. No	59	19.2%
2. Full-time	151	49.2%
3. Part-time	64	20.8%
4. Free-lance	33	10.7%
	307	100%

V34 Are you currently working in the profession in which you teach? (Missing=1; .8% of total)

[Vocational faculty only]	Frequency	Valid Percent
1. No	18	14.6%
2. Full-time	72	58.5%
3. Part-time	22	17.9%
4. Free-lance	11	8.9%
	121	100%

V35 Have you ever worked in the profession in which you teach? (Missing=13; 4.1% of total)

		Frequency	Valid Percent
1.	No	27	9.0%
2.	Full-time	220	73.1%
3.	Part-time	35	11.6%
4.	Free-lance	19	6.3%
		301	100%

V35 Have you ever worked in the profession in which you teach? (Missing=3; 2.4% of total)

[Vocational faculty only]		Frequency	Valid Percent
1.	No	2	1.7%
2.	Full-time	108	89.3%
3.	Part-time	5	4.1%
4.	Free-lance	6	5.0%
		121	100%

V36 How long ago did you work in the profession in which you teach? (Missing=225; 71.4%)

		Frequency	Valid Percent
1.	Never	23	25.8%
2.	One year	27	30.3%
3.	Two years	4	4.5%
4.	Three years	6	6.7%
5.	Five years	9	10.1%
6.	Ten years	7	7.9%
7.	More than ten years	13	14.6%
		89	100%

V36 How long ago did you work in the profession in which you teach? (Missing=1; 5.6%)

[Voc faculty not currently in profession.]		Frequency	Valid Percent
1.	Never	1	5.9%
2.	One year	3	17.6%
3.	Two years	2	11.8%
4.	Three years	2	11.8%
5.	Five years	2	11.8%
6.	Ten years	3	17.6%
7.	More than ten years	4	23.5%
		18	100%

V37 For what length did you work in the profession in which you teach? (Missing=25; 7.9%)

		Frequency	Valid Percent
1.	Never	25	8.7%
2.	One year	12	4.2%
3.	Two years	11	3.8%
4.	Three years	12	4.2%
5.	Five years	36	12.5%
6.	Ten years	50	17.3%
7.	Fifteen years	49	17.0%
8.	Twenty years	29	10.0%
9.	Over twenty years	65	22.5%
		289	100%

V37 For what length did you work in the profession in which you teach? (Missing=6; 4.8%)

[Vocational faculty only.]	Frequency	Valid Percent
1. Never	3	2.5%
2. One year	2	1.7%
3. Two years	2	1.7%
4. Three years	4	3.4%
5. Five years	12	10.2%
6. Ten years	26	22.0%
7. Fifteen years	25	21.2%
8. Twenty years	12	10.2%
9. Over twenty years	32	27.1%
	118	100%

V38 Do you currently teach part-time at another school or college? (Missing=4: 1.3%)

	Frequency	Valid Percent
1. No	198	63.9%
2. High School	7	2.3%
3. Two-year college	66	21.3%
4. Four-year college	30	9.7%
5. Both 2 and 4 year colleges	9	2.9%
	310	100%

V39 Do you currently teach full-time at another school or college? (Missing=5; 1.6% of total)

	Frequency	Valid Percent
1. No	257	83.2%
2. High School	38	12.3%
3. Two-year college	3	1.0%
4. Four-year college	11	3.6%
	309	100%

V40 How many hours per week do you teach at other schools or colleges? (Missing=2; .6%)

Hours	Frequency	Valid Percent
none	157	50.3%
1 hour	7	2.2%
2 hours	2	.6%
3 hours	20	6.4%
4 hours	4	1.3%
5 hours	2	.6%
6 hours	22	7.1%
7 hours	3	1.0%
8 hours	6	1.9%
9 hours	11	3.5%
10 hours	3	1.0%
12 hours	12	3.8%
15 hours	10	3.2%
16 hours	2	.6%
18 hours	8	2.6%
20 hours	4	1.3%
21 hours	1	.3%
22 hours	1	.3%
23 hours	1	.3%
24 hours	2	.6%
25 hours	15	4.8%
26 hours	1	.3%
29 hours	1	.3%
30 hours	4	1.3%
35 hours	1	.3%
36 hours	3	1.0%
37 hours	2	.6%
40 hours	6	1.9%
50 hours	1	.3%
Mean: 6.88 Median: 0 Mode: 0	312	100%

V41 How many different classes do you teach at other schools or colleges?

Classes	Frequency	Valid Percent
None	159	50.6%
1 class	47	15.0%
2 classes	51	16.2%
3 classes	25	8.0%
4 classes	19	6.1%
5 classes	13	4.1%
Mean: 1.16 Median: 0 Mode: 0	314	100%

V42 How many students do you teach at other schools or colleges? (Missing=10; 3.2%)

Students	Frequency	Valid Percent
1. None	152	50.0%
2. 1-19	7	2.3%
3. 20-29	19	6.3%
4. 30-39	14	4.6%
5. 40-49	13	4.3%
6. 50-59	6	2.0%
7. 60-69	9	3.0%
8. 70-79	8	2.6%
9. 80-89	9	3.0%
10. 90-99	10	3.3%
11. 100 or more	57	18.8%
	304	100%

V43 Age (Missing responses=4; 1.3% of total)	Frequency	Valid Percent
1. 20-29	19	6.1%
2. 30-39	93	30.0%
3. 40-49	123	39.7%
4. 50-59	59	19.0%
5. 60-69	16	5.2%
	310	100%

V44 Gender (Missing responses=5; 1.6% of total)	Frequency	Valid Percent
1. Male	183	59.2%
2. Female	126	40.8%
	301	100%

V45 Highest Degree Earned (Missing responses=4; 1.3% of total)

	Frequency	Valid Percent
1. High School	14	4.5%
2. Associate	22	7.1%
3. Bachelor	68	21.9%
4. Master	155	50.0%
5. Doctorate	51	16.5%
	310	100%

V45 Highest Degree Earned (Missing responses=4; 1.3% of total)

[Academic faculty only.]	Frequency	Valid Percent
1. High School	0	0%
2. Associate	0	0%
3. Bachelor	22	12.0%
4. Master	120	65.6%
5. Doctorate	41	22.4%
	124	100%

APPENDIX C: STATISTICAL ANALYSES

Table 1: Chi Square Analysis [N=259*]
Involvement Profile: Division Type

Variable	Chi Square	DF	Significance	High (residual)	Low (residual)
V9 Talk Div. Dean	28.50	8	<.001	Career(+10.9)	Voc/tech(-2.9)
V10 Talk Dept. Chair	41.59	8	<.00001	Career(+17.7)	Business(-11.3)
V11 Talk Faculty	50.52	8	<.00001	Career(+9.3)	Business(-20.1)
V13 Like meet faculty	8.99	4	.06		
V14 Guidance FT faculty	6.57	4	.16		
V16 Guidance Div. Dean	4.28	4	.37		
V17 Memos Div. Dean	5.27	4	.26		
V18 Attend meetings	38.64	4	<.00001	Career(+8.9)	Business(-10.4)
V20 College involvement	9.42	4	.051	Business(+7.8)	M/Sci&Lib/A(-4.4)
V21 Division involvement	11.49	4	.02	Career(+6.9)	Liberal Arts(-6.0)
V22 Want more inv. Coll.	7.29	4	.12		
V23 Want more inv. Div.	11.61	4	.02	Liberal Arts (+8.7)	Voc/Tech(-6.6)

[Minimum expected frequency ≥ 5.0.]

*** Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.**

Table 2: Chi Square Analysis [N=259*]
Involvement Profile: "New and Old Part-timers"

Variable	Chi Square	DF	Significance	>10 yrs (residual)	up to 1 yr (residual)
V9 Talk Div. Dean	9.97	6	.13		
V10 Talk Dept. Chair	8.01	6	.24		
V11 Talk Faculty	2.19	6	.90		
V13 Like meet faculty	3.58	3	.31		
V14 Guidance FT faculty	6.73	3	.08		
V16 Guidance Div. Dean	5.02	3	.17		
V17 Memos Div. Dean	6.23	3	.10		
V18 Attend meetings	1.84	3	.61		
V20 College involvement	8.56	3	.04	+10.0	+3.9
V21 Division involvement	2.15	3	.54		
V22 Want more inv. Coll.	9.36	3	.02	-9.0	+6.0
V23 Want more inv. Div.	14.80	3	.002	-8.7	+10.3

[Minimum expected frequency ≥ 5.0.]

*** Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.**

Table 3: Chi Square Analysis [N=259*]
Involvement Profile: "Hopeful Full-timers"

Variable	Chi Square	DF	Significance	Hopeful FT (residual)
V9 Talk Div. Dean	3.95	2	.14	
V10 Talk Dept. Chair	6.65	2	.04	+8.8
V11 Talk Faculty	4.71	2	.09	
V13 Like meet faculty	20.84	1	.00001	+17.3
V14 Guidance FT faculty	4.55	1	.03	+8.4
V16 Guidance Div. Dean	5.28	1	.02	+8.4
V17 Memos Div. Dean	3.70	1	.054	
V18 Attend meetings	.78	1	.37	
V20 College Involvement	.008	1	.93	
V21 Division Involvement	.74	1	.39	
V22 Want more inv. Coll.	21.74	1	<.00001	+17.7
V23 Want more inv. Div.	23.81	1	<.00001	+17.9

[Minimum expected frequency ≥ 5.0.]

*** Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.**

Table 4: Chi Square Analysis [N=259*]
Involvement Profile: "Vocational and Academic"

Variable	Chi Square	DF	Significance	Vocational (residual)	Academic (residual)
V9 Talk Div. Dean	2.62	2	.27		
V10 Talk Dept. Chair	1.94	2	.38		
V11 Talk Faculty	4.15	2	.13		
V13 Like meet faculty	5.97	1	.01	-9.2	+9.2
V14 Guidance FT faculty	2.39	1	.12		
V16 Guidance Div. Dean	.12	1	.73		
V17 Memos Div. Dean	4.48	1	.03	+5.6	-5.6
V18 Attend meetings	8.80	1	.003	+8.8	-8.8
V20 College Involvement	2.35	1	.125		
V21 Division Involvement	7.52	1	.006	+10.2	-10.2
V22 Want more inv. Coll.	5.27	1	.02	-8.6	+8.6
V23 Want more inv. Div.	6.64	1	.0099	-9.3	+9.3

[Minimum expected frequency ≥ 5.0.]

*** Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.**

Table 5: Chi Square Analysis [N=259*] Involvement Profile: Male and Female

Variable	Chi Square	DF	Significance	Male (residual)	Female (residual)
V9 Talk Div. Dean	.45	2	.80		
V10 Talk Dept. Chair	.34	2	.84		
V11 Talk Faculty	.56	2	.75		
V13 Like meet faculty	2.63	1	.11		
V14 Guidance FT faculty	.45	1	.50		
V16 Guidance Div. Dean	.23	1	.63		
V17 Memos Div. Dean	1.61	1	.20		
V18 Attend meetings	.01	1	.91		
V20 College Involvement	6.62	1	.01	+9.9	-9.9
V21 Division Involvement	.70	1	.40		
V22 Want more inv. Coll.	1.42	1	.23		
V23 Want more inv. Div.	2.69	1	.10		

[Minimum expected frequency ≥ 5.0.]

*** Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.**

Table 6: Chi Square Analysis [N=259*] Involvement Profile: Day and Evening

Variable	Chi Square	DF	Significance	Day (residual)	Evening (residual)
V9 Talk Div. Dean	5.76	2	.056		
V10 Talk Dept. Chair	14.36	2	.0008	+11.6	-11.6
V11 Talk Faculty	7.43	2	.02	+8.2	-8.2
V13 Like meet faculty	.36	1	.55		
V14 Guidance FT faculty	.02	1	.90		
V16 Guidance Div. Dean	.005	1	.94		
V17 Memos Div. Dean	.05	1	.83		
V18 Attend meetings	8.02	1	.005	+7.1	-7.1
V20 College Involvement	2.68	1	.10		
V21 Division Involvement	.41	1	.52		
V22 Want more inv. Coll.	1.83	1	.18		
V23 Want more inv. Div.	1.32	1	.25		

[Minimum expected frequency ≥ 5.0.]

*** Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.**

Table 7: Chi Square Analysis [N=259*]
Involvement Profile: "Moonlighters"

Variable	Chi Square	DF	Significance	"Moonlighters" Residual
V9 Talk Div. Dean	1.75	2	.42	
V10 Talk Dept. Chair	3.60	2	.17	
V11 Talk Faculty	4.51	2	.11	
V13 Like meet faculty	2.82	1	.09	
V14 Guidance FT faculty	.04	1	.84	
V16 Guidance Div. Dean	.04	1	.85	
V17 Memos Div. Dean	.51	1	.47	
V18 Attend meetings	.04	1	.84	
V20 College Involvement	.44	1	.51	
V21 Division Involvement	2.38	1	.12	
V22 Want more inv. Coll.	2.18	1	.14	
V23 Want more inv. Div.	1.63	1	.20	

[Minimum expected frequency ≥ 5.0.]

*** Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.**

Table 8: Chi Square Analysis [N=259*]
Involvement Profile: "Full-time Teachers"

Variable	Chi Square	DF	Significance	Full-time Teachers Residual
V9 Talk Div. Dean	.60	2	.74	
V10 Talk Dept. Chair	.13	2	.93	
V11 Talk Faculty	1.73	2	.42	
V13 Like meet faculty	.35	1	.56	
V14 Guidance FT faculty	1.91	1	.17	
V16 Guidance Div. Dean	4.59	1	.03	-5.6
V17 Memos Div. Dean	.13	1	.72	
V18 Attend meetings	2.56	1	.11	
V20 College Involvement	.24	1	.62	
V21 Division Involvement	.99	1	.32	
V22 Want more inv. Coll.	.01	1	.90	
V23 Want more inv. Div.	.12	1	.72	

[Minimum expected frequency ≥ 5.0.]

*** Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.**

Table 9: Chi Square Analysis [N=259*]
Involvement Profile: "Freeway Fliers"

Variable	Chi Square	DF	Significance	"Freeway Fliers" Residual
V9 Talk Div. Dean	2.63	2	.27	
V10 Talk Dept. Chair	3.11	2	.21	
V11 Talk Faculty	2.99	2	.22	
V13 Like meet faculty	3.80	1	.051	+7.1
V14 Guidance FT faculty	.16	1	.69	
V16 Guidance Div. Dean	1.26	1	.26	
V17 Memos Div. Dean	.04	1	.84	
V18 Attend meetings	.006	1	.94	
V20 College Involvement	.80	1	.37	
V21 Division Involvement	.44	1	.51	
V22 Want more inv. Coll.	1.09	1	.30	
V23 Want more inv. Div.	1.63	1	.20	

[Minimum expected frequency ≥ 5.0.]

*** Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.**

Table 10: Summary Table Chi Square Analysis
Involvement Profiles

Characteristic	Talk Dean	Talk Chair	Talk Fac.	Meet Fac.	Guide FT Fac.	Guide Div D.	memos	meet fac.	Inv coll.	Inv. div.	More Inv.C.	More Inv. D.
Division Type												
Math & Science												
Business		-	-					-				
Career	+	+	+					+		+		
Liberal Arts										-		+
Voc/Technical	-											-
New Part-timer									+		+	+
Old Part-timer									+		-	-
Hopeful-Full-timer		+		+	+		+				+	+
Vocational & Academic				A			V	V		V	A	A
Male & Female									M			
Day & Evening		D	D					D				
Moonlighters												
Full-time Teachers												
Freeway Fliers				+								

Table 11: Chi Square Analysis [N=314]
Professional Profile: Division Type

Variable	Chi Square	DF	Significance	High (residual)	Low (residual)
V25 Length teaching PT	42.11	12	.00003	Business(+10.5) (over 10 yrs)	Liberal Arts(+12.1) (1 yr or less)
V26 Day or Evening	41.56	4	<.00001	Business(+16.9) (evening faculty)	Career (-12.6) (evening faculty)
V29 Hours teaching	58.44	12	<.00001	Math/Sci(+7.3) (8 or more hours)	Business(+18.8) (up to 3 hours)
V30 Number of classes	20.45	4	.0004	Career (+11.8) (2 or more classes)	Business(+11.2) (1 class)
V32 Hope teach full-time	28.14	4	.00001	Liberal Arts(+17.7)	Business(-13.7)
V33 Vocational or Academic	141.62	4	<.00001	Voc/Tech(+24.4)	Liberal Arts(-31.4)
V34 Work full-time	38.03	4	<.00001	Business(+18.2)	Liberal Arts(-17.4)
V39 Teach full-time	18.51	4	.001	Math/Sci(+8.1)	Business(-5.0)
V38 Teach part-time	31.02	4	<.00001	Liberal Arts(+18.1)	Business(-9.3)
V43 Age	25.20	8	.001	Business(+12.6) (50 and over)	Career(+7.1) (under 40)
V44 Male or Female	38.03	4	<.00001	Liberal Arts(+17.2) (female)	Business(+11.6) (male)
V45 Highest degree	91.68	8	<.00001	Liberal Arts(+6.8) (Ph.D.)	Voc/Tech(+19.2) (B.A. or less)

[Minimum expected frequency ≥ 5.0.]

Table 12: Chi Square Analysis [N=314]
Professional Profile: "New and Old Part-timers"

Variable	Chi Square	DF	Significance	>10 yrs (res.)	6-10 (res.)	2-5 (res.)	≤1 yr (res)
V26 Day or Evening	36.12	3	<.00001	+15.1 (eve.)			+17.9 (day)
V29 Hours teaching	19.38	9	.02	+8.1 (≤3hrs)		+10.3 (>7hrs)	
V30 Number of classes	.18	3	.98				
V32 Hope teach full-time	13.29	3	.004	-8.2			+14.4
V33 Vocational or Academic	5.91	3	.116				
V34 Work full-time	19.12	3	.0003		+9.8		-15.8
V39 Teach full-time	11.76	3	.008	+4.2			-8.6
V38 Teach part-time	13.45	3	.004		-9.2	+8.1	
V43 Age	40.86	6	<.00001	+15.0 (≥50)			+12.4 (<40)
V44 Male or Female	14.89	3	.002	+10.6 (male)			+12.0 (female)
V45 Highest degree	1.94	6	.92				

[Minimum expected frequency ≥ 5.0.]

Table 13: Chi Square Analysis [N=314]
Professional Profile: "Hopeful Full-timers"

Variable	Chi Square	DF	Significance	"Hopeful Full-time"
V25 Length teaching PT	13.29	3	.004	+14.4 (up to 1 year)
V26 Day or Evening	14.30	1	.0002	+14.6 (day)
V29 Hours teaching	16.11	3	.001	+13.1 (over 7 hrs)
V30 Number of classes	4.21	2	.12	
V33 Vocational or Academic	18.96	1	.00001	+18.4 (academic)
V34 Work full-time	27.34	1	<.00001	-22.6
V39 Teach full-time	.33	1	.56	
V38 Teach part-time	25.29	1	<.00001	+20.9
V43 Age	11.86	2	.003	+2.9 (under 40)
V44 Male or Female	15.26	1	.00009	+16.6 (female)
V45 Highest degree	23.02	2	.00001	+13.3 (M.A.)

[Minimum expected frequency ≥ 5.0.]

Table 14: Chi Square Analysis [N=314]
Professional Profile: Vocational and Academic

Variable	Chi Square	DF	Significance	Voc. (residual)	Acad. (residual)
V25 Length teaching PT	5.91	3	.12		
V26 Day or Evening	5.70	1	.02	+9.1 (evening)	+9.1(day)
V29 Hours teaching	5.80	3	.12		
V30 Number of classes	8.04	2	.02	+6.9 (3 or more)	+5.1 (2 classes)
V32 Hope teach full-time	18.96	1	.00001	-18.4	+18.4
V34 Work full-time	7.02	1	.008	+11.3	-11.3
V39 Teach full-time	2.06	1	.15		
V38 Teach part-time	15.27	1	.00009	-16.1	+16.1
V43 Age	.69	2	.71		
V44 Male or Female	5.16	1	.02	+9.5 (male)	+9.5 (female)
V45 Highest degree	94.34	2	<.00001	+39.2 (BA/less)	+28.8 (M.A.)

[Minimum expected frequency ≥ 5.0.]

Table 15: Chi Square Analysis [N=314]
Professional Profile: Male and Female

Variable	Chi Square	DF	Significance	Female (residual)	Male(residual)
V25 Length teaching PT	14.89	3	.002	+12.0 (up to 1 yr)	+10.6 (over 10yrs)
V26 Day or Evening	10.62	1	.001	+12.5 (day)	+12.5 (eve.)
V29 Hours teaching	7.20	3	.07		
V30 Number of classes	1.86	2	.39		
V32 Hope teach full-time	15.26	1	.00009	+16.6	-16.6
V33 Vocational or Academic	5.16	1	.02	+9.5 (acad.)	+9.5 (voc.)
V34 Work full-time	24.03	1	<.00001	-21.0	+21.0
V39 Teach full-time	2.08	1	.15		
V38 Teach part-time	10.32	1	.001	+13.3	-13.3
V43 Age	1.67	2	.43		
V45 Highest degree	15.17	2	.0005	+16.7 (M.A.)	+10.3 (B.A.)

[Minimum expected frequency ≥ 5.0.]

Table 16: Chi Square Analysis [N=314]
Professional Profile: Day and Evening

Variable	Chi Square	DF	Significance	Day (residual)	Eve. (residual)
V25 Length teaching PT	36.12	3	<.00001	+17.9 (up to 1yr)	+15.1 (over 10yrs)
V29 Hours teaching	21.97	3	.00007	+13.6 (over 7 hrs)	+10.7 (up to 3 hrs)
V30 Number of classes	11.12	2	.004	+3.3 (3 or more)	+12.3 (1 class)
V32 Hope teach full-time	14.30	1	.0001	+14.6	-14.6
V33 Vocational or Academic	5.70	1	.02	+9.1 (Acad.)	+9.1 (Voc.)
V34 Work full-time	18.14	1	.00002	-16.5	+16.5
V39 Teach full-time	8.05	1	.005	-7.3	+7.3
V38 Teach part-time	8.17	1	.004	+10.7	-10.7
V43 Age	8.24	2	.02	+9.7 (under 40)	+7.5 (50 and over)
V44 Male or Female	10.62	1	.001	+12.5 (female)	+12.5 (male)
V45 Highest degree	1.79	2	.41		

[Minimum expected frequency ≥ 5.0.]

Table 17: Chi Square Analysis [N=314]
Professional Profile: "Moonlighters"

Variable	Chi Square	DF	Significance	"Moonlighters" (residual)
V25 Length teaching PT	19.12	3	.0003	+9.8 (6-10 yrs)
V26 Day or Evening	18.14	1	.00002	+16.5 (Evening)
V29 Hours teaching	22.88	3	.00004	+15.0 (up to 3 hrs)
V30 Number of classes	4.51	2	.10	
V32 Hope teach full-time	27.34	1	<.00001	-22.6
V33 Vocational or Academic	7.03	1	.008	+11.3 (Vocational)
V39 Teach full-time	5.30	1	.02	+6.6
V38 Teach part-time	27.17	1	<.00001	-21.8
V43 Age	.92	2	.63	
V44 Male or Female	24.03	1	<.00001	+21.0 (male)
V45 Highest degree	26.46	2	<.00001	+18.3 (B.A.)

[Minimum expected frequency ≥ 5.0.]

Table 18: Chi Square Analysis [N=314]
Professional Profile: "Full-time Teachers"

Variable	Chi Square	DF	Significance	Full-time Teachers (residual)
V25 Length teaching PT	11.77	3	.008	+4.2 (over 10 yrs)
V26 Day or Evening	8.05	1	.005	+7.3 (evening)
V29 Hours teaching	4.25	3	.24	
V30 Number of classes	.01	1	.90	
V32 Hope teach full-time	.33	1	.56	
V33 Vocational or Academic	2.06	1	.15	
V34 Work full-time	5.30	1	.02	+6.6
V38 Teach part-time	15.14	1	.0001	-10.4
V43 Age	4.16	2	.12	
V44 Male or Female	2.08	1	.15	
V45 Highest degree	6.27	2	.04	+7.0 (M.A.)

[Minimum expected frequency ≥ 5.0.]

Table 19: Chi Square Analysis [N=314]
Professional Profile: "Freeway Fliers"

Variable	Chi Square	DF	Significance	"Freeway Fliers"(residual)
V25 Length teaching PT	13.45	3	.004	+8.1(2-5 yrs)
V26 Day or Evening	8.17	1	.004	+10.7 (Day)
V29 Hours teaching	6.24	3	.10	
V30 Number of classes	.86	1	.35	
V32 Hope teach full-time	25.29	1	<.00001	+20.9
V33 Vocational or Academic	15.27	1	.00009	+16.1(Academic)
V34 Work full-time	27.17	1	<.00001	-21.8
V39 Teach full-time	15.14	1	.0001	-10.4
V43 Age	2.64	2	.27	
V44 Male or Female	10.32	1	.001	+13.3 (female)
V45 Highest degree	17.42	2	.0002	+17.0 (M.A.)

[Minimum expected frequency ≥ 5.0.]

Table 20: Summary Table Chi Square Analysis
Professional Profiles

Characteristic	Long Teach	Day/ Eve	Hrs Teach	No. Class	Hope FT	Voc/ Acad.	Work FT	Teach FT	Teach PT	Age	M/F	Degree
Division Type												
Math & Science			+					+				
Business	+	Eve	-	-	-		+	-	-	+	M	
Career		Day		+						-		
Liberal Arts	-				+	Acad.	-		+		F	+
Voc/Technical						Voc						-
New Part-timer		Day	+		+		-	-	+	-	F	
Old Part-timer		Eve	-		-		+	+	-	+	M	
Hopeful-FT	-	Day	+			Acad.	-		+	-	F	M.A.
Voc. & Acad.		A-Day		V+	A+		V+		A+		A-F	A+
Male & Female	M+	M-Eve			F+	F-Ac.	M+		F+			F+
Day & Evening	D+		D+	D+	D+	D-Ac.	E+	E+	D+	E+	D-F	
Moonlighters	+	Eve	-		-	Voc		+	-		M	-
FT Teachers	+	Eve					+	-				M.A.
Freeway Fliers	-	Eve			+	Acad.	-	-			F	M.A.

Table 21: Chi Square Analysis [N=256*]
Involvement in Division and in College

	V21 Involvement in Division		
V20 Involvement in College	**1. Involved**	**2. Not Involved**	Row Totals
1. Involved	**126** EF=86.9 Residual=39.1	**8** EF=47.1 Residual= -39.1	**134** 52.3%
2. Not Involved	**40** EF=79.1 Residual= -39.1	**82** EF=42.9 Residual=39.1	**122** 47.7%
Column Total	**166** 64.8%	**90** 35.2%	**256** 100%

Chi-Square: 105.07 Degrees of Freedom: 1 Significance: <.00001
***Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.**

Table 22: Chi Square Analysis [N=241*]
Desire for More Involvement in Division and College

	V23 More Involvement in Division		
V22 More Involvement in College	**1. Yes**	**2. No**	Row Totals
1. Yes	**140** EF=96.3 Residual=43.7	**6** EF=49.7 Residual= -43.7	**146** 60.6%
2. No	**19** EF=62.7 Residual= -43.7	**76** EF=32.3 Residual=43.7	**95** 39.4%
Column Totals	**159** 66.0%	**82** 34.0%	**241** 100%

Chi-Square: 147.66 Degrees of Freedom: 1 Significance: <.00001
***Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.**

Table 25: Chi Square Analysis [N=226*]
Desire to Meet Faculty and Desire for More Involvement in College

	Y22 More Involvement in College		
Y13 Meet Faculty	**1. Yes**	**2. No**	Row Totals
1. Yes	**99** EF=73.2 Residual= 25.8	**20** EF=45.8 Residual= -25.8	**119** 52.7%
2. No	**40** EF=65.8 Residual= -25.8	**67** EF=41.2 Residual= 25.8	**107** 47.3%
Column Totals	**139** 61.5%	**87** 38.5%	**226** 100%

Chi-Square: 49.94 Degrees of Freedom: 1 Significance: <.00001
***Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.**

Table 26: Chi Square Analysis [N=224*]
Desire to Meet Faculty and Desire for More Involvement in Division

	Y23 More Involvement in Division		
Y13 Meet Faculty	**1. Yes**	**2. No**	Row Totals
1. Yes	**99** EF=77.7 Residual= 21.3	**17** EF=38.3 Residual= -21.3	**116** 51.8%
2. No	**51** EF=72.3 Residual= -21.3	**57** EF=35.7 Residual= 21.3	**108** 48.2%
Column Totals	**150** 67.0%	**74** 33.0%	**224** 100%

Chi-Square: 36.74 Degrees of Freedom: 1 Significance: <.00001
***Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.**

Table 27: Chi Square Analysis [N=259*]
Guidance from Division Dean with Involvement

Variable	Chi Square	DF	Significance	Received Guidance(residual)
V9 Talk Div. Dean	7.13	2	.03	+5.6
V10 Talk Dept. Chair	4.03	2	.13	
V11 Talk Faculty	1.11	2	.57	
V13 Like meet faculty	2.78	1	.10	
V14 Guidance FT faculty	30.67	1	<.00001	+20.1
V17 Memos Div. Dean	1.95	1	.16	
V18 Attend meetings	2.87	1	.09	
V20 College Involvement	15.44	1	.00009	+14.4
V21 Division Involvement	15.11	1	.0001	+13.6
V22 Want more inv. Coll.	3.60	1	.06	
V23 Want more inv. Div.	2.63	1	.10	

[Minimum expected frequency ≥ 5.0.]
*** Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.**

Table 28: Discriminant Analysis [N=198*]
Involvement Profile by Division Type

Division	Prior Probability	Correctly Predicted Group Members
1. Math & Science	13%	11.1%
2. Business	27%	75.5%
3. Career	16%	46.9%
4. Liberal Arts	27%	47.2%
5. Voc/Tech	17%	51.5%

50.51% of grouped cases correctly classified.

Structure Matrix: Pooled Within-Groups Correlations between Discriminating Variables and Canonical Discriminant Functions

Variables		Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
V9	Talk Div. Dean	-.06	**.65**	.07
V10	Talk Dept. Chair	.27	**.67**	-.18
V11	Talk to Faculty	**.62**	.08	.27
V13	Like Meet Faculty	-.11	.15	**.61**
V14	Guidance FT Faculty	.25	.05	-.33
V16	Guidance Div. Dean	-.12	.17	-.15
V17	Memos Div. Dean	.20	-.13	-.05
V18	Attend Div. Meetings	**.51**	.18	-.32
V20	Involved College	-.11	.27	-.36
V21	Involved Div.	-.007	.38	-.40
V22	Want more Inv. Coll	-.09	.20	**.41**
V23	Want more Inv Div.	-.06	**.44**	**.44**

Canonical Discriminant Functions Evaluated at Group Means

Division Type	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1. Math & Science	-.37	.22	-.29
2. Business	**.97**	.07	.36
3. Career	-.76	**-.77**	.27
4. Liberal Arts	.27	-.09	**-.51**
5. Voc/Tech	**-.96**	.61	.23

Canonical Discriminant Functions

Values	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
Eigenvalue	.55	.17	.14
Percent of Variance	62.40	19.51	15.94
Canonical Correlation	.60	.38	.35
Wilks' Lambda	.47	.73	.86
Chi-squared	141.42	58.49	28.44
Degrees of Freedom	48	33	20
Significance	<.0001	.0041	.09

* Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken. Of 269 cases, 61 had at least one missing discriminating variable.

Table 29: Multiple Regression Analysis [N=259*]
Involvement Profile: "New and Old Part-Timers"*****

Variable	Beta	T	Probability
V23 Want more inv. Division	-.26	-4.43	<.00001
V10 Talk Dept. Chair	-.15	-2.54	.0118
R=.30	R square=.09	Pairwise N= 223	

* Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.
**Last step, stepwise regression.
***Old part-timers results in table: those who have been teaching over 5 years.

Table 30: Multiple Regression Analysis [N=259*]
Involvement Profile: "Hopeful Full-timers"**

Variable	Beta	T	Probability
V23 Want more inv. Div.	.23	3.71	.0003
V13 Like meet faculty	.21	3.43	.0007
V10 Talk Dept. Chair	.17	2.95	.0035
V17 Memos Div. Dean	.12	2.03	.0429
R=.41	R square=.17	Pairwise N= 223	

* Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.
**Last step, stepwise regression.

Table 31: Multiple Regression Analysis [N=259*]
Involvement Profile: "Vocational and Academic"*****

Variable	Beta	T	Probability
V21 Division Involvement	.17	2.61	.0097
V23 Want more inv. Div.	-.17	-2.76	.0062
V18 Attend Division Meetings	.13	2.02	.0446
R=.29	R square=.09	Pairwise N= 223	

* Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.
**Last step, stepwise regression.
*** Vocational faculty results in table.

Table 32: Multiple Regression Analysis** [N=259*] Involvement Profile: Day and Evening***

Variable	Beta	T	Probability
V10 Talk Dept. Chair	-.18	-2.86	.0046
V18 Attend Division Meetings	-.14	-2.32	.0209
R=.25	R square=.06	Pairwise N= 223	

* Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.
**Last step, stepwise regression.
*** Evening faculty results in table.

Table 33: Multiple Regression Analysis** [N=259*] Involvement Profile: "Moonlighters"

Variable	Beta	T	Probability
V11 Talk Faculty	-.12	-1.99	.0471
R=.12	R square=.02	Pairwise N= 223	

* Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.
**Last step, stepwise regression.

Table 34: Multiple Regression Analysis** [N=259*] Involvement Profile: "Full-time Teachers"

Variable	Beta	T	Probability
V16 Guidance Division Dean	-.13	-2.18	.0303
R=.13	R square=.02	Pairwise N= 223	

* Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.
**Last step, stepwise regression.

Table 35: Discriminant Analysis [N-283*]
Professional Profile by Division Type

Division	Prior Probability	Correctly Predicted Group Members
1. Math & Science	13%	52.8%
2. Business	27%	63.6%
3. Career	20%	31.0%
4. Liberal Arts	26%	84.9%
5. Voc/Tech	14%	64.1%

61.13% of grouped cases correctly classified.

Structure Matrix: Pooled Within-Groups Correlations between Discriminating Variables and Canonical Discriminant Functions

Variables		Function 1 "Academics"	Function 2 "Moonlighters"	Function 3 "FT Teachers"
V25	Length of Teaching	-.22	.38	.19
V26	Day or Evening	-.19	**.58**	.17
V29	Hours per week FC	.13	**-.51**	**.56**
V30	Different classes FC	-.03	-.41	.19
V32	Hope full-time	.25	-.27	-.03
V33	Vocational/Academic	**.87**	.33	.13
V34	Work in Profession	-.26	**.47**	.02
V39	Teach full-time	.08	.07	**.52**
V38	Teach part-time	.25	-.21	-.27
V43	Age	-.11	.37	-.06
V44	Gender	.26	-.41	-.33
V45	Highest degree earned	**.45**	.19	-.36

Canonical Discriminant Functions Evaluated at Group Means

Division Type	Function 1 "Academics"	Function 2 "Moonlighters"	Function 3 "FT Teachers"
1. Math & Science	.75	.38	**.97**
2. Business	-.56	**.75**	-.32
3. Career	-.25	**-.76**	-.20
4. Liberal Arts	**1.39**	-.16	-.17
5. Voc/Tech	**-1.81**	-.39	.36

Canonical Discriminant Functions

Values	Function 1 "Academics"	Function 2 "Moonlighters"	Function 3 "FT Teachers"
Eigenvalue	1.14	.33	.19
Percent of Variance	68.08	19.48	11.08
Canonical Correlation	.73	.50	.40
Wilks' Lambda	.29	.62	.82
Chi-squared	337.83	129.86	52.68
Degrees of Freedom	48	33	20
Significance	<.0001	<.0001	.0001

* Of 314 cases, 31 had at least one missing discriminating variable.

Table 36: Multiple Regression Analysis** [N=314]
Professional Profile: "New and Old Part-timers"***

Variable	Beta	T	Probability
V26 Day or Evening (evening=positive)	.27	5.20	<.0001
V43 Age	.29	6.03	<.0001
V44 Male or Female (female=positive)	-.13	-2.66	.0082
V30 Number of classes	.16	3.28	.0011
V34 Work full-time	.14	2.67	.0080
V39 Teach full-time	.10	2.00	.0460
R=.54	R square=.30	Pairwise N= 302	

**Last step, stepwise regression.
***Old part-timers results in table: those who have been teaching more than 5 years.

Table 37: Multiple Regression Analysis** [N=314]
Professional Profile: "Hopeful Full-timers"

Variable	Beta	T	Probability
V34 Work full-time	-.14	-2.46	.0143
V38 Teach part-time	.18	3.39	.0008
V45 Highest degree	.21	4.02	.0001
V29 Hours teaching	.17	3.19	.0016
V25 Length teaching part-time	-.13	-2.55	.0111
R=.46	R square=.21	Pairwise N= 302	

**Last step, stepwise regression.

Table 38: Multiple Regression Analysis** [N=314]
Professional Profile: "Vocational and Academic"***

Variable	Beta	T	Probability
V45 Highest degree	-.45	-9.27	<.0001
V38 Teach part-time	-.19	-3.86	.0001
V39 Teach full-time	-.11	-2.29	.0226
R=.52	R square=.27	Pairwise N= 302	

**Last step, stepwise regression.
*** Vocational faculty results in table.

Table 39: Multiple Regression Analysis** [N=314]
Professional Profile: Male and Female***

Variable	Beta	T	Probability
V34 Work full-time	-.20	-3.53	.0005
V25 Length teaching part-time	-.16	-2.97	.0032
V32 Hope teach full-time	.13	2.24	.0260
R=.35	R square=.12	Pairwise N= 302	

**Last step, stepwise regression.
*** Female faculty results in table.

Table 40: Multiple Regression Analysis** [N=314]
Professional Profile: Day and Evening***

Variable	Beta	T	Probability
V25 Length teaching part-time	.32	6.03	<.0001
V29 Hours of teaching	-.21	-3.89	.0001
V34 Work full-time	.11	2.04	.0421
R=.44	R square=.19	Pairwise N= 302	

**Last step, stepwise regression.

*** Evening faculty results in table.

Table 41: Multiple Regression Analysis** [N=314]
Professional Profile: "Moonlighters"

Variable	Beta	T	Probability
V32 Hope teach full-time	-.14	-2.57	.0105
V38 Teach part-time	-.19	-3.50	.0005
V44 Male or Female(positive=female)	-.16	-2.92	.0037
V29 Hours of teaching	-.18	-3.47	.0006
V25 Length teaching part-time	.13	2.54	.0115
R=.47	R square=.22	Pairwise N= 302	

**Last step, stepwise regression.

Table 42: Multiple Regression Analysis** [N=314]
Professional Profile: "Full-time Teachers"

Variable	Beta	T	Probability
V38 Teach part-time	-.22	-3.85	.0001
V26 Length teaching part-time	.18	3.28	.0012
V33 Vocational or Academic(positive=Ac.)	.14	2.61	.0095
R=.31	R square=.09	Pairwise N= 302	

**Last step, stepwise regression.

Table 43: Multiple Regression Analysis** [N=314]
Professional Profile: "Freeway Fliers"***

Variable	Beta	T	Probability
V34 Work full-time	-.19	-3.50	.0005
V32 Hope teach full-time	.18	3.29	.0011
V39 Teach full-time	-.19	-3.74	.0002
V33 Vocational or Academic	.16	3.08	.0023
R=.43	R square=.18	Pairwise N= 302	

**Last step, stepwise regression.
***Old part-timers results in table.

Table 44: Multiple Regression Analysis** [N=259*]
Involvement in College predicted with Involvement Variables

Variable	Beta	T	Probability
V16 Guidance Div. Dean	.20	3.39	.0008
V18 Attend meetings	.15	2.54	.0114
V9 Talk Div. Dean	.15	2.51	.0006
R=.33	R square=.11	Pairwise N= 223	

*Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.
**Last step, stepwise regression.

Table 45: Multiple Regression Analysis** [N=259*]
Involvement in Division predicted with Involvement Variables

Variable	Beta	T	Probability
V18 Attend meetings	.20	3.46	.0006
V16 Guidance Div. Dean	.20	3.32	.0011
V9 Talk Div. Dean	.14	2.36	.0190
R=.35	R square=.13	Pairwise N= 223	

*Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.
**Last step, stepwise regression.

Table 46: Multiple Regression Analysis** [N=259*]
Desire More Involvement in College predicted with Involvement Variables

Variable	Beta	T	Probability
V13 Like meet faculty	.44	8.00	<.0001
V14 Guidance from FT faculty	.14	2.59	.0102
R=.46	R square=.21	Pairwise N= 223	

*Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.
**Last step, stepwise regression.

Table 47: Multiple Regression Analysis** [N=259*]
Desire More Involvement in Division predicted with Involvement Variables

Variable	Beta	T	Probability
V13 Like meet faculty	.38	6.51	<.0001
R=.38	R square=.14	Pairwise N= 223	

*Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.
**Last step, stepwise regression.

Table 48: Multiple Regression Analysis** [N=259*]
Teaching Hours predicted with Involvement Variables

Variable	Beta	T	Probability
V11 Talk Faculty	.28	4.86	<.0001
V23 Want more inv. Div.	.18	3.08	.0023
V18 Attend meetings	.17	2.86	.0046
R=.38	R square=.14	Pairwise N= 223	

*Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.
**Last step, stepwise regression.

Table 49: Multiple Regression Analysis** [N=314]
Teaching Hours predicted with Professional Profile Variables

Variable	Beta	T	Probability
V34 Work full-time	-.19	-3.29	.0011
V26 Day or Evening (Evening=positive)	-.19	-3.37	.0008
V32 Hope teach full-time	.16	2.74	.0065
V45 Highest degree	-.11	-2.10	.0365

R=.37 R square=.14 Pairwise N= 302

**Last step, stepwise regression.

Table 50: T-Test [N=305]
Teaching Hours of "Hopeful Full-timers"

				(Pooled Variance Estimate)		
V32 Hope FT	Cases	Mean	St. Dev.	T Value	df	2-tail probability
Group 1: No	134	2.13	1.13	-4.04	303	<.001
Group 2: Yes	171	2.67	1.19			

Table 51: T-Test [N=305]
Teaching Hours of Vocational and Academic

				(Pooled Variance Estimate)		
V33 Voc/Academic	Cases	Mean	St. Dev.	T Value	df	2-tail probability
Group 1: Vocational	124	2.32	1.20	-1.45	303	.147
Group 2: Academic	181	2.52	1.19			

Table 52: T-Test [N=307]
Teaching Hours of Male and Female

				(Pooled Variance Estimate)		
V44 Male/Female	Cases	Mean	St. Dev.	T Value	df	2-tail probability
Group 1: Male	182	2.29	1.19	-2.44	305	.015
Group 2: Female	125	2.63	1.18			

Table 53: T-Test [N=309]
Teaching Hours of Day and Evening

				(Pooled Variance Estimate)		
V26 Day/Evening	Cases	Mean	St. Dev.	T Value	df	2-tail probability
Group 1: Day	82	2.94	1.15	4.69	307	<.001
Group 2: Evening	227	2.24	1.16			

Table 54: T-Test [N=305]
Teaching Hours of "Moonlighters"

				(Pooled Variance Estimate)		
V34 Moonlighters	Cases	Mean	St. Dev.	T Value	df	2-tail probability
Group 1: No	156	2.75	1.16	4.77	303	<.001
Group 2: Yes	149	2.12	1.14			

Table 55: T-Test [N=307]
Teaching Hours of "Full-time Teachers"

				(Pooled Variance Estimate)		
V39 FT Teachers	Cases	Mean	St. Dev.	T Value	df	2-tail probability
Group 1: No	270	2.41	1.21	-.49	305	.626
Group 2: Yes	37	2.51	1.10			

Table 56: T-Test [N=310]
Teaching Hours of "New and Old Part-Timers"

				(Pooled Variance Estimate)		
V25 Length Teaching	Cases	Mean	St. Dev.	T Value	df	2-tail probability
Group 1: New-5 yrs	199	2.54	1.18	2.20	308	.029
Group 2: 6-15+ yrs	111	2.23	1.21			

Table 57: T-Test [N=308]
Teaching Hours of "Freeway Fliers"

V38 Fwy Fliers	Cases	Mean	St. Dev.	(Pooled Variance Estimate) T Value	df	2-tail probability
Group 1: No	196	2.34	1.18	-1.82	306	.069
Group 2: Yes	112	2.60	1.19			

Table 58: T-Test [N=155*]
Teaching Hours and College Involvement

V20 College Inv.	Cases	Mean	St. Dev.	(Pooled Variance Estimate) T Value	df	2-tail probability
Group 1: Yes	135	2.44	1.23	-.31	253	.757
Group 2: No	120	2.49	1.19			

* Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.

Table 59: T-Test [N=254*]
Teaching Hours and Division Involvement

V21 Division Inv.	Cases	Mean	St. Dev.	(Pooled Variance Estimate) T Value	df	2-tail probability
Group 1: Yes	166	2.43	1.22	-.59	252	.555
Group 2: No	88	2.52	1.21			

* Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.

Table 60: T-Test [N=241*]
Teaching Hours and Desire More Involvement in College

V22 More Inv. College	Cases	Mean	St. Dev.	(Pooled Variance Estimate) T Value	df	2-tail probability
Group 1: Yes	147	2.60	1.21	1.54	239	.125
Group 2: No	94	2.35	1.23			

* Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.

ERIC Clearinghouse for
Junior Colleges APR 5 1990

Table 61: T-Test [N=239*]
Teaching Hours and Desire More Involvement in Division

				(Pooled Variance Estimate)		
V23 More Inv. Division	Cases	Mean	St. Dev.	T Value	df	2-tail probability
Group 1: Yes	158	2.66	1.21	2.62	237	.009
Group 2: No	81	2.23	1.19			

* Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.

Table 62: T-Test [N=246*]
Teaching Hours and Talk to Division Dean

				(Pooled Variance Estimate)		
V9 Talk to Div. Dean	Cases	Mean	St. Dev.	T Value	df	2-tail probability
Group 1: Often	118	2.58	1.27	1.66	244	.099
Group 2: Infrequently	128	2.32	1.16			

* Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.

Table 63: T-Test [N=209*]
Teaching Hours and Talk to Faculty

				(Pooled Variance Estimate)		
V11 Talk to Faculty	Cases	Mean	St. Dev.	T Value	df	2-tail probability
Group 1: Often	154	2.79	1.17	4.83	207	<.0001
Group 2: Infrequently	55	2.91	1.14			

* Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.

Table 64: T-Test [N=254*]
Teaching Hours and Attend Division Meetings

				(Pooled Variance Estimate)		
V18 Attend Meetings	Cases	Mean	St. Dev.	T Value	df	2-tail probability
Group 1: Yes	44	3.00	1.20	3.24	252	.001
Group 2: No	210	2.36	1.19			

* Includes all faculty who were not new in the semester the survey was taken.